2017

An Examination of the Convergence of Theory in Libraries and Archives

Eric Willey
Illinois State University, emwille@ilstu.edu

An Examination of the Convergence of Theory in Libraries and Archives[1]
By Eric Willey

ABSTRACT: While the convergence of libraries, archives, and museums (LAMs) has received considerable attention, a literature review indicates that integration has primarily occurred around digitization projects, exhibits, and budgets, while professional identity serves as a barrier to integration of scholarly work.[2] The present study examines to what extent scholarly theory between archives and libraries has converged by surveying citations from 2008-2016 for top-rated library journals in archival journals (and vice-versa), examining Library of Congress Subject Headings of cataloged books and dissertations in OCLC WorldCat from 2008-2016, and examining papers generated by special projects related to convergence in LAMs. Findings indicate that there is no consistent increase in the number of cross-citations between disciplines in scholarly articles or the number of monographs cataloged with "archives" and "libraries" subject headings in WorldCat that would indicate a convergence of libraries and archives. An examination of papers devoted to convergence of LAMs shows that while theory and scholarly publishing is not directly addressed, distinct professional identities can be considered a barrier to convergence. It is concluded that while LAMs may be converging in some areas, they are not converging in the area of theory, possibly due to a desire to maintain discreet professional identities and low engagement with theory by some archivists.

Introduction

Librarians, archivists, and museum curators often borrow tools from one another. A finding aid created in DACS can be entered into a MARC record in OCLC using RDA. The Social Networks and Archival Context (SNAC) project uses MARC records, archival finding aids, and authority records from Virtual International Authority File (VIAF), OCLC Research, NACO/Library of Congress Name Authority File, Union List of Artist Names, and Getty Vocabulary Program to create a research tool that integrates access to resources and biographical historical contexts.[3] Conceptual models from the museum and

library community have been harmonized to create FRBRoo, an object-oriented version of FRBR.[4] Combined with the desires of patrons to have all information accessible from one search portal, this can be seen as evidence of the convergence of these institutions. However, the presence of split positions and multiple standards implies resistance to that convergence.

The present study examines to what extent theory has converged between the archives and library disciplines by looking for evidence of library journal articles which cite archives journal articles (and vice-versa) from 2008 to 2016, counting books and dissertations from 2008 to 2016 cataloged in OCLC WorldCat which include the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSHs) "libraries" and "archives," and examining five papers which delved into the subject of convergence of LAMs. The first two are ways in which theory is disseminated in the profession, while the last offers an overview of convergence. While the term "LAMs" is used throughout the article, particularly when discussing other research which examines all three institutions, the present research is confined to the fields of libraries and archives.

Findings do not support the argument that libraries and archives are converging in regards to theory. There is no increase over time in cross-citations or the number of books and dissertations published which have LCSHs for libraries and archives. White papers concerning convergence touch lightly on theory, and if theory is assumed to be a part of professional identity it is seen as a barrier to convergence rather than a facilitator. While libraries, archives, and museums may be converging as institutions, people employed in those institutions remain in silos. If convergence is a goal to be furthered, assisting people in opening those silos may be beneficial.

Literature review

A literature review provides mixed support for the convergence of archives and libraries. As recently as

2015, the Society of American Archivists published *Archives in the Libraries: What Librarians and Archivists Need to Know to Work Together* by Jeannette A. Bastian, Megan Sniffin-Marinoff, and Donna Webber. The theme of this work suggests that while archivists and librarians are increasingly working more closely, divisions remain. The authors argue that "the parallel path [of libraries and archives] has not held completely steady, but convergence has not won the day, although there are signs pointing in that direction."[5] With factors such as services, resources, and combining resources to facilitate the scholarship of patrons driving convergence, and concerns over maintaining discrete professional identities pushing back, the authors envision a future in which "archives and libraries are working toward some measure of collaboration and coexistence, if not complete convergence," particularly for large institutions.[6] While the authors do not specifically address the convergence (or lack of) between archival and library theory, if theory is considered as part of professional identity it can be considered to be a factor hampering or limiting convergence in general and would not be expected to occur.

A second article, "From coexistence to convergence: studying partnerships and collaboration among libraries, archives, and museums," reported similar findings. Individuals at five separate institutions which were undergoing or had already undergone some form of collaboration or convergence were interviewed, with interviewee Tom Hikerson saying that "the greatest challenges of convergence are connected to professional identity, which in many ways connects to professional expertise."[7] John Wright of Taylore Family Digital Library elaborated on this point, commenting that "converging the thinking is more difficult than adopting similar practices."[8] The authors go so far as to conclude that "the institutions we studied are attempting to find the right balance between respecting professional expertise and merging systems. The success of convergence projects seems to require that one find this balance."[9] If this is the case, the lack of cross-citations in scholarly citations and other works identified by the present research is to be expected.

In her article arguing for integration of archival expertise into the management of born-digital material, Jackie Dooley states that "successful digital programs and projects inevitably involve a disparate cast of characters, and administrative boundaries are sometimes permeated."[10] Dooley further argues that "if the institution does not take advantage of the archivist's array of skills, then others must become well versed in the issues if unpublished digital resources are to be acquired and overseen efficiently, effectively, and responsibly."[11] In either case, whether archivists work with born-digital materials in libraries, or if librarians acquire archival skills relevant to this area, this represents a convergence of professional duties between archivists and non-archivists in the area of born digital materials.

Deanna Marcum provides an exhaustive list documenting "a seeming explosion of conferences, forums, workshops, and other activities devoted to similar ideas" regarding commonalities between and collaborative opportunities for libraries, archives, and museums.[12] Marcum also comments that considerable progress has been made in overcoming the lack of common standards for describing data that might otherwise impede collaborations.[13] While some collaborations between LAMs seem to be achievable (such as the creation of exhibitions), others (such as full mergers of collections across libraries, museums, and archives) may prove extremely difficult, and even require changes in professional education in the long run.[14] This suggests that collaboration is easier to achieve in areas where professional practice may be temporarily set aside in favor of providing access (such as the fonds or arrangement of archival materials being set aside for a temporary exhibit, for example), but does not occur as frequently in other areas such as mergers of collections where standards may conflict. Possible examples of these conflicts include creating cataloging records for finding aids (where inventory lists are often difficult to include) and use of Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) in finding aids in ways which library catalogers might not approve (particularly regarding using subject headings as form or genre terms). In either case, this is an example of patron demand for access driving

convergence in ways where it might conflict with professional practice. It is difficult to say whether

this supports or refutes the current thesis further without knowing the content of these conferences,

forums, and workshops. If theory is being discussed, this could indicate that theory is converging in

different venues than publications; however, if these events focus solely on practice that is further

evidence that theory itself is not converging.

While Marcum describes the considerable progress in creation of common standards, a 2014 study on

audiovisual materials in BIBFRAME by Kara Van Malssen notes that "various communities have

developed independent content descriptive approaches specific to certain content types and formats. As

these approaches are applied to a common data model, search and discovery challenges in library

catalogs have become common."[15] In addition to integration of various standards in searches, Malssen

observes that richer metadata is sometimes provided by these independent approaches, and that

> in addition to the basic user tasks of finding, identifying, selecting, and obtaining content
> in a catalog, additional, optional questions may also be asked in some cases: What were
> the circumstances of the work's creation? What additional resources may exist that will
> assist in contextualizing the content? What are the details of the format(s) on which this
> content is contained?[16]

The proliferation of formats further confuses the issue of integration, and

> there may be a desire among catalogers to align their practice with other content and
> structure standards available within various AV communities for the purpose of increased
> interoperability and data exchange, especially when libraries and archives are collecting
> resources and metadata from broadcast, music publishing, film distribution, or other
> creative industries that might incorporate very different data models than those found in
> libraries.[17]

Marcum's findings can be taken in one of two ways, with the multiplication of independent standards

and alignment of cataloging to those practices being seen as convergence, or the development of new

descriptive approaches seen as divergence from traditional practice. It seems likely that depending on

where one looks both of these cases are true, with catalogers and archivists using what existing

standards they can (convergence) while developing independent standards where needed (divergence).

Even as libraries, archives, and museums are converging in certain areas, the nature of Web 2.0 is

blurring lines between professionals and the community of users. As Fidelia Ibekwe-SanJuan and

Elaine Ménard note, "A massive adoption of participatory web technologies by the general public has

led to a reconfiguration and repositioning of professionals and of the stakeholders in many sectors."[18]

In this instance, Ibekwe-SanJuan and Ménard question if the distinctions between LAMs are still valid

or if they are "being challenged by digital phenomena and are the boundaries between them becoming

porous due to new needs generated by the public social web (for example, 'museo-libraries')?"[19] The

authors ultimately conclude that

> the oft-proclaimed liberating and empowering capacity of Web 2.0 for the general public
> has not yet taken professional practices in the cultural heritage institutions by storm,
> whereas it has caused a blurring of frontiers between amateurs and professionals in e-
> commerce, politics or journalism where UGC, user feedback, and the entry of new
> players have upset old hierarchies, strongholds, and professional practices.[20]

This reinforces the notion that convergence tends to occur around digital projects, especially when one

considers that the general public might well create a digital or online resource with what information

professionals might consider a mishmash of archival, museum, and library materials. If the public is not

relying on theory to create their online collections, and those collections are fundamentally the same as

those created by archivists and librarians, then digital collections do not represent an area where theory

is converging.

In the same issue that Ibekwe-SanJuan and Ménard's article appears Cheryl Klimaszewski argues that

"the lines between the LAMs are blurring as their similarities are emphasized more than their

differences. This calls into question not just what LAMs are, and it also reveals our expectations about what we believe they should be in the twenty-first century."[21] Klimaszewski argues that the "socialization that shapes lumping and splitting emerges from both inside the professions, through practice and preparatory education, as well as through outside forces that include policy makers, government agencies, grant-making institutions, and researchers."[22] While two of the key drivers of collaboration are digitization and finance or budget issues,[23] it is acknowledged that "LAM re-convergence may not be a new idea, history can neither erase nor negate the century's worth of practices that have developed in the meantime."[24] In the literature review Klimaszewski concludes that "a picture is emerging of LAM professionals who are trained in relatively separate traditions within programs at educational institutions that are slow to embrace change."[25] One manifestation of this training is coursework tailored to archival specialization or a certificate offered within a library program that suggests a lack of convergence between LAMs, with students taking courses and presumably learning theory and practice specific to the sub-discipline of archives.

This may also be a factor inhibiting engagement with scholarly research by archivists. When library schools treat archives as a sub-discipline, rather than a professional discipline in its own right, it implies that any archival research or scholarly output is both subordinate to and separate from theory in library and information science. The SAA Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies states that "A graduate program in archival studies should provide students with a solid foundation in archival theory, methodology, and practice augmented by instruction in allied fields."[26] Yet it is worth noting that "graduate programs" in archival studies frequently take the form of specializations, tracks, or certificates in archives which are granted along with an MLIS. Furthermore, it is possible to get a certificate of individual accreditation through the Academy of Certified Archivists without an MLIS by substituting qualifying experience.[27] While the requirement of core courses in MLIS programs should lead to at least some common ground between libraries and archives and encourage convergence,

archivists can and do still come to archives with an MA in History and practical experience, which would discourage convergence.

The lack of dedicated archival graduate programs also discourages doctoral level study, as without a distinct degree program anyone wishing to pursue a Ph.D. in archival studies must instead pursue a Ph.D. in LIS, History, or another field and write their doctoral dissertation on archives. If archivists cannot get a master's level or doctorate in their field (or sub-field depending on who is being asked), is it any surprise that they are not as engaged with theory? This also serves as a self-perpetuating cycle where archivists do not get doctoral degrees, which leads to a lack of archives faculty, which makes it more difficult and less rewarding for archivists to get doctoral degrees, and so on. Regardless of cause, this is another reason why some archivists don't engage heavily with theory.

The idea that archives is a professional discipline separate from library and information science is supported by the presence of split positions. Katherine Ryner states that in her split position at St. Mary's College of Maryland, "From literally the first day, the library director said you need to split your time half and half."[28] Ryner's position is not unique, and a 2012 survey by Mary Manning and Judy Silva of college and university archivists found that 150 of 296 (51%) respondents also had library duties, with many (but not all) dual librarian/archivists being special collections librarians.[29] Manning and Silva go on to note that their survey revealed a significant number of catalog librarian/archivist positions, and that such "dual positions are quite common and not merely in special collections."[30] The authors state that their survey was sent to archives listservs and targeted individuals who considered themselves archivists with library duties, and that the literature would benefit from "further research targeting librarians with archival duties."[31] Even with this caveat, the survey found a significant number of people who had a position specifically described as dual or split between archival and library duties. This evidence also argues against the idea that LAMs are converging in professional practice, with

people splitting their duties and time into separate categories and occupying what are specifically described as "split" positions. While the impetus for creating a split position may vary (lack of funds or sufficient work for two separate positions seem like probable motives) the very idea of a split position implies separate practices (with different theoretical underpinnings) and workflows performed by the same person.

Manning and Silva's research also raises the question: Since dual or split positions exist, do these individuals read and interact with the scholarly literature from archives and libraries, and if so, how? While no research regarding split positions specifically could be located, in a 2009 survey of reading and publishing practices by archivists Cory L. Nimer found that most respondents read *American Archivist*, with *Archival Issues* the second most read journal. No other titles were read by more than 10% of respondents, and on average respondents read 1.26 journals regularly, while 25% answered that they did not read any archival journals.[32] Nimer goes on to report that access may influence this finding, as respondents had the greatest access to *American Archivist* and *Archival Issues*, and an average of 1.6 journals (21% of respondents stated they had access to no archival journals).[33]

Nimer's survey also solicited responses on publishing, finding that 65.8% of respondents had not published, with publishing rates higher among archival educators (100%) and those employed by academic institutions (42.9%).[34] Upon reviewing the survey results, Nimer concluded that, "The data suggest that archivists are reading significantly less journal content than those in the related field of library science and that they are writing at similarly low rates."[35] Nimer does qualify these findings by noting that some archivists may believe that their practice does not have a theoretical underpinning, and others may identify more closely with other fields such as history.[36] It should be noted that the statement that some members of the archival profession believe their discipline lacks theoretical underpinnings is based on a 1994 debate between Terry Eastwood and John W. Roberts in *Archivaria*

where Roberts asserted that "a considerable portion of it [archival theory] is abysmal claptrap."[37] It is certainly possible this attitude towards theory changed in the fifteen-year interval between 1994 and Nimer's article, and further changed in the 23-year interval between 1994 and this article. Still, it seems hard to argue that LAMs are converging in a meaningful way at the theoretical level if archivists are not even reading archival theory once they are out of graduate school, let alone theory in library science.

In a subsequent study, Kathleen Fear and Paul Conway shed more light on archivists' views of theory and practice. In a survey of Society of American Archivist readers and affiliates regarding *The American Archivist*, 60.5% of 494 respondents felt that the journal was viewed as primarily a scholarly or academic journal, and "many of the comments reflect[ed] dissatisfaction with this situation."[38] Several respondents used free-text fields to elaborate on their dissatisfaction with what they saw as the journal's focus on theory, and the authors quite reasonably concluded that "The variety of commentary and lack of consensus on the proper balance in the journal between theory and practice may be a symptom of the intellectual diversity of the archival profession itself."[39] If a significant segment of professional archivists' reading of scholarly journals and publication efforts is focused on practical advice that severely limits opportunities for theory to converge.

A study similar to Nimer's by Laura Manzari asked full-time faculty of American Library Association accredited LIS programs to rate eighty-nine LIS journals on their importance to research and teaching.[40] Interestingly, several archival journals appear on this list. Of the eighty-nine journals ranked by mean averaged (descending, with the highest ranking being 4.04) *American Archivist* ranked thirty-third (1.44), *Archivaria* ranked fifty-ninth (1.01) and *Archival Science* ranked sixtieth (0.99).[41] While these are not strong rankings for the archives journals, it does indicate at least some faculty in accredited programs are keeping abreast of archival theory via the published literature.

Finally, in 2016 OCLC sponsored *Collective Wisdom: An Exploration of Library, Archives, and Museum Cultures*.[42] This project created an eighteen-member cohort drawn from libraries, archives, and museums. While the project report notes that the findings were based on the experiences of these eighteen individuals and reflective in nature rather than the result of a literature review or research, it does note that "Arguably, LAM organizations are inherently cross-sector, with shared affinities and needs, yet practitioners tend to retreat to their own affinity groups for answers to professional quandaries."[43] Again, this suggests a lack of convergence beyond areas where practice is favored more heavily than theory (budget issues, for example) in line with previous articles, and supported by the present study.

There is additional evidence that LAMs are converging, but in a sometimes halting and perhaps inconsistent manner. The mere existence of the ALA-SAA-AAM Combined Committee on Archives, Libraries and Museums (CALM) suggests that professionals within these institutions are interested in talking to each other, and if nothing else the sheer amount of acronyms involved demands that they be taken seriously. However, at the May 2017 Society of American Archivists Council meeting, the SAA voted to disband CALM in August 2018.[44] The Council came to this decision after reviewing a report prepared by Council Liaison Rachel Vagts and SAA Chair Lynette Stoudy which said that:

> For the past few years there has been little or no participation from the American Alliance of Museums (AAM) representative. At the same time, the American Library Association and SAA have had numerous joint initiatives that had appointed task groups completely separate from the membership of CALM. There has been little or no coordination between CALM and those Council-appointed groups.[45]

The August 2018 time was chosen to allow CALM to complete current projects, and prepare a white paper on committee findings. This should not be taken as a rejection of collaboration, but is evidence

that CALM might benefit from being restructured and disbanding and reforming may be the easiest way to accomplish this goal. Council agreed that SAA and ALA (and possibly AAM) leaders "should be engaged in regular communications."[46] If professional identity is a barrier to convergence (as suggested), a coalition of groups where people become members based on professional identity may well be a difficult way to achieve convergence.

Journal Citation Methodology

In selecting library journals to examine, this study relied on the work of others. In 2012 Jungfeng Xia included open access journals in an impact study of library and information science publications. In a break with past studies that utilized impact factors, Xia utilized the h-index to measure rank, stating that the "h-index is an improvement over simple citation measures, emphasizing the total number of citations or publications, and it works properly for comparing publications in the same field."[47] The five highest ranking journals by h-index were *Information & Management*, *MIS Quarterly*, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, and *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* and *Journal of Management Information Systems* tied for the fifth rank with both having an h-index of 44.[48]

In a follow-up study, Judith M. Nixon devised a methodology including "expert opinion surveys, acceptance and circulation rates, impact factors, h-indexes, and journals with local faculty articles" as factors to "create a tiered list of journals tailored to the institution."[49] After applying this methodology to the 72 refereed titles in the study, Nixon found that "six journals received six or seven tallies each, identifying them as the top six journals: *College & Research Libraries*, *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, *Library Journal*, *Library Resources & Technical Services*, and *Reference & User Services Quarterly*."[50]

Five of the top six library journals identified by Judith M. Nixon were checked for archival journal citations.[51] The study omitted *Library Journal* (the sixth journal in Nixon's list) because it acts more as a trade journal, and does not publish scholarly articles. Archival journals checked for library journal citations included the five journals identified by Nimer as most frequently read, as well as *Journal of the Society of Archivists* (published as *Archives and Records* from 2012 forward) and *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*.[52] The additional archival journals were added due to the fact that there were significantly more library journal articles than archives journal articles, although this still did not create parity in numbers. The additional journals chosen were selected from a short list of archival journals which the author had access to and which covered the date span in question.

Each journal's title was individually searched for electronically, including spelling variations (such as substituting "and" for "&" and vice-versa), abbreviated, and altered journal titles. Search results were then examined individually to ensure that they were actual citations and not false positives (many articles employed the term "provenance" for example, without actually citing the journal *Provenance*). Scholarly peer-reviewed articles were checked, although editorials, reviews of single monographs, messages from prominent figures, obituaries, and similar articles were not. Multiple citations of different articles in the same article were counted, although multiple citations of the same article in a single article were not (i.e., if *Libraries* by Jane Jones and *Digitization* by Sally Smith appeared in the same article, it counted as two citations; however, if an article cited *Libraries* by Jane Jones five times it only counted as a single citation). This survey intended to measure the breadth of theory integration, therefore one article cited numerous times might convey the impression that a wider range of articles had been included than was necessarily the case.

Journal Citation Limitations

An obvious possible limitation to the current study is the low amount of engagement with scholarly literature by archivists found in previous studies. If that trend has continued and archivists do not engage with theory or engage with it in avenues other than the scholarly literature, evidence of convergence would not occur there. If this primarily occurs in workshops and conferences, an examination of conference programs and proceedings and workshop topics would be beneficial and possibly refute the current study. Additionally, the five library journals selected may not necessarily have a focus on publishing in the areas where LAMs are converging. Counting cross-citations for a different selection of library journals may yield different results. The literature review suggests that journals focused on digitization, budgeting, and exhibits may show higher rates of cross-citation than the sample used in this study, although that would leave significant areas of theory outside those subjects unexamined. Further review of additional archives journals may also be beneficial, although such journals are limited in number. Finally, the present work makes no attempt to determine if articles deal with topics that are theoretical or practical in nature. If these articles were separated by some means and examined discreetly, there might be an increase over time in articles which deal with theory.

Journal Citation Results

In total, 770 archival journal articles and 1055 library journal articles were examined. Aggregate findings for the citation examination are presented below. Each chart shows the number of times that journals in that discipline cited one of the journals in the other discipline for each year. For example, the articles in the 2014 archives journals examined contained eight citations for articles in *College & Research Libraries* (table 1). Further, *Archivaria* was not cited in the library journals examined for the year 2014 (table 3).

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
TABLE 1 **Number of Library Journal Citations Found in Archival Journals**										

College & Research Libraries	3	2	6	2	3	3	8	16	1	44
Journal of the Medical Library Association	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	4
Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	5
Library Research & Technical Services	1	2	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	10
Reference & User Services Quarterly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	5
Total	5	4	7	6	4	7	11	19	5	68

Table 1: The number of citations found for each library journal in archival journals from 2008-2016.

TABLE 2 Number of Articles in Archival Journals Citing Library Journals										
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Archivaria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Journal of Archival Organization	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	NA[53]	NA	6
Journal of Society of Archivists and Archives / Archives and Records[54]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Archivist	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	2	9
Archival Issues	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	5
Provenance	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	5
RBM: A Journal of Rare Books and Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	0	13
Total	2	3	3	5	3	6	8	7	3	40

Table 2: The number of articles in archival journals which cite library journals.

The 770 archival journal articles contained 68 citations of library journals across 40 articles (Tables 1 and 2). There is no steady increase over time, which would be expected if convergence was accompanied by an integration of theory. Given the relatively small amount of results the citations were further examined to determine if any patterns emerged. The largest cluster of citations was an article in *The American Archivist* in 2015 titled "Archival Divides and Foreign Countries? Historians, Archivists,

Information-Seeking, and Technology: Retrospect and Prospect" by Alex H. Poole which cited six articles from *College and Research Libraries*.[55] This article does consider the role information technology plays in historians' research, which supports the literature review's assertion that convergence is at least partially driven by patron access to materials.

A subjective grouping of the articles based on their titles showed seven articles related to digitization and online materials, one related to exhibits, and none related to budgeting (although one article was present which discussed facilities and likely included information on budgets). All these are areas in which convergence would be expected from the literature review. Other large groupings included special collections and libraries (nine articles), classroom and user studies (five articles), archival literacy and instruction (four articles), and access and description (four articles). With the exception of access and description, these are not areas where the literature review explicitly identifies convergence as happening (although in the largest grouping, special collections and libraries, one might argue convergence is an inherent part of the institution already given that they typically mix books and archival materials), although it also does not preclude it. In order to aid analysis of the validity of these conclusions and future research an expanded appendix including the complete list of articles which were cross-cited is available at the author's institutional repository.[56]

TABLE 3										
Number of Archival Journal Citations Found in Library Journals										
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Archivaria	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	6	3	15
Journal of Archival Organization	0	4	1	0	10	0	1	6	0	22
Journal of Society of Archivists and Archives / Archives and Records[57]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Archivist	2	2	5	4	17	2	3	35	1	71
Archival Issues	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	1	8
Provenance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
RBM: A Journal of	1	0	2	1	7	0	3	3	5	22

Rare Books and Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage									
Total	3	8	11	7	37	3	7	53	10	139

Table 3: The number of citations found for each archival journal in library journals from 2008-2016.

TABLE 4										
Number of Articles in Library Journals Citing Archival Journals										
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
College & Research Libraries	1	0	1	1	1	2	3	2	2	13
Journal of the Medical Library Association	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Library Research & Technical Services	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	15
Reference & User Services Quarterly	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Total	3	2	4	4	3	3	5	6	3	33

Table 4: The number of articles in library journals which cite archival journals.

The 1055 library journal articles contained 139 citations of archival journals across 33 articles (Tables 3 and 4). Again, there is no steady increase over time which would suggest an integration of theory to match the convergence of libraries and archives, although there are spikes in the number of citations in 2012 and 2015. In 2012 the article "Dual Archivist/Librarians: Balancing the Benefits and Challenges of Diverse Responsibilities" by Mary Manning and Judy Silva (discussed in the literature review) cited 28 articles in archival journals. The large number of citations is unsurprising given that the article dealt with dual archivist/librarians. Similarly, the spike in 2015 is not the result of a surge in cross-disciplinary articles, but of a single article ("Reflections on Archival User Studies" by Hea Lim Rhee) which cites articles in archival journals 45 times.[58] Given the subject matter of the article, this is also not a surprise.

For articles in library journals which cited archival journals, there were five which could be considered to be on the topic of digitization or digital materials, and none which were primarily focused on budgets and exhibits. The most common topic was metadata (seven articles) and there were three articles dealing with special collections. Four articles specifically dealt with the topic of archives. This data also does not support the integration of theory as a component of convergence. There is no increase in citations or number of articles over time, and articles which have the largest number of cross citations specifically deal with either archivists or archival user studies, which even makes the idea that they represent an integration of archival theory into library scholarship suspect. It is more likely that they were articles dealing with archival subjects which happened to be published in library journals.

Monograph Analysis Methodology

OCLC WorldCat was searched using the Library of Congress Heading Subject (LCSH) Terms "archives" and "libraries" in the "Subject:" field. Limits were set to Year: 2008-2016, Content: Non-Fiction, Format: Book, and Language: English. In order to limit duplicate format results, "Print book" and "Thesis/dissertation" were selected in the results sidebar. For comparison purposes searches using only the terms "archives" in one search and only the term "libraries" in a second search in the "Subject:" field were also conducted, with the same limits.

For further analysis of the topics of the monographs with both subject headings duplicate results (usually due to differences in the catalog records, for example editions by different publishers, which resulted in some books being listed twice) were removed. Foreign language materials, and other non-scholarly works (for example, brief informational brochures cataloged as books, finding aids, and guides to collection holdings) which remained in the results were also removed from the list of works analyzed.

Monograph Analysis Limitations

While the citation formats in journal articles were peer-reviewed and taken from scholarly journals, the monograph analysis may have included non-scholarly material. Limits were set to "non-fiction" which (if cataloged correctly) should limit the selection to works which are at least intended to be factual, but may not have undergone peer review or been written as scholarly works. For example, publicity material about specific libraries and archives was likely included in the sample. Another issue is that the LCSH for special collections is "Libraries $x Special collections." Therefore, works about special collections may discuss matters related to both archives and libraries, but would not necessarily appear in the archives search. Also, subject analysis traditionally requires that a significant portion of a work deal concern the subject in question to qualify for the inclusion of a subject heading. There may have been works which dealt with either archives or libraries, but not in a sufficient amount to qualify for the inclusion of the second LCSH. Finally, the same books appear to have appeared in the search results multiple times based on having the same ISBNs (although different OCLC numbers). This may be either due to differences which required new catalog records (new editions or years of publication which retained the same ISBNs, for example) or through the creation of redundant catalog records.

Monograph Analysis Results

In total, the search returned 416 results for books with both LCSHs for "Archives" and "Libraries," 10,373 for "Libraries," and 4,500 for "Archives." A breakdown of results by year is shown in table 5. In terms of raw numbers, works for all three categories have substantially decreased since 2008. There is also no increase in the percentage of books cataloged with both "archives" and "libraries" as a percentage of the whole for works cataloged with either "archives" or "libraries." This suggests that authors are actually writing fewer books which are being cataloged as being about both archives and libraries. Similar to the citation analysis, the lack of an increase in either raw numbers or books with

"archives" and "libraries" as a percentage of the whole refutes the idea that convergence is occurring in theory being disseminated through such works.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
TABLE 5									
Number of Books and Dissertations Cataloged with "Libraries" and "Archives" LCSHs									
Libraries and Archives LCSH	65	67	55	39	39	40	49	38	24
Libraries LCSH only	1488	1360	1295	1105	1177	1127	1125	897	799
Libraries and Archives LCSH/Libraries LCSH	4.4%	4.9%	4.2%	3.5%	3.3%	3.5%	4.4%	4.2%	3.0%
Archives LCSH only	611	695	615	508	464	447	464	396	300
Libraries and Archives LCSH/Archives LCSH	10.6%	9.6%	8.9%	7.7%	8.4%	8.9%	10.6%	9.6%	8.0%
Libraries or Archives LCSH	2099	2055	1910	1613	1641	1574	1589	1293	1099
Libraries and Archives LCSH/Libraries or Archives LCSH	3.1%	3.3%	2.9%	2.4%	2.4%	2.5%	3.1%	2.9%	2.2%

Table 5: The number of books cataloged with the Archives LCSH, Libraries LCSH, and both LCSHs.

A further analysis of the works returned with both "archives" and "libraries" as LCSHs was conducted. While additional subject headings were not examined, reading the titles of the results show that 33 of the 237 appear to be about digitization or digital materials, 34 to government records or presidential libraries, 19 to special collections, and 18 to special populations or user communities (LGBTQ+, tribal libraries and museums, latinx users, and aboriginal peoples). Only two titles related to exhibits were found (although lack of "museums" as a LCSH term likely influenced this) and no titles related directly to budgets or budgeting were found; however, two books whose titles suggested they discussed management in general were among the search results.

This provides support for the findings of the literature review that digitization is one area of convergence. Convergence in areas of exhibits and budgeting was not strongly supported, although the present results also do not necessarily refute the literature review due to the exclusion of museums as a LCSH and the relatively narrow scope of budget issues. The number of books concerned with

government records and presidential libraries, special collections, and institutions focused on specific communities also suggests that theory is converging (or has converged) in areas where the nature of the institution makes professional identity less of an issue. Presidential libraries, special collections, and community archives and libraries often have archival and library materials intermingled or in close proximity, and work regarding these institutions may reflect a need to draw from both disciplines. However, the possibility remains that books about these institutions are drawing theory from both disciplines separately with little or no integration, and do not represent areas of convergence so much as areas where the two disciplines exist side-by-side, but are still practiced separately.

Examination of papers related to convergence in LAMs Methodology

A convenience sample consisting of five white papers and reports was examined for if and how theory might be converging in libraries and archives. Two of these papers were recommended by members of OCLC when discussing the article (*Beyond the Silos of the LAMs* and *Libraries, Archives, and Museums in the Twenty-First Century*), and the remainder were selected because they were published recently (*Collective Wisdom*; *Prospects and Strategies for Deep Collaboration*; and *National Agenda for Continuing Education and Professional Development*).

Examination of papers related to convergence in LAMs Limitations

The largest limitation of this portion of the research is that the selection of papers reviewed was in no way random or scientific, and may reflect this author's biases. The selection may also not be representative of the discussion of convergence as a whole, particularly if the papers' authors were looking at specific areas of convergence which focused on practice and excluded theory.

Examination of papers related to convergence in LAMs Results

Overall, these documents do not address scholarly publishing or the underlying theory of the various LAM components extensively; however, several papers do recommend greater continuing education and professional development as a means of increasing convergence. The *Collective Wisdom* paper in particular encourages individuals to engage in scholarship across fields, reinforcing the conclusion that this practice has so far resisted convergence.[59] The general lack of discussion regarding convergence of theory and advocacy for expanded scholarship across fields also suggests that it is not occurring, or possibly is not being examined.

In *Prospects and Strategies for Deep Collaboration in the Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums Sector* Jill Deupi and Charles Eckman report on the findings of a 2016 summit hosted by the University of Miami in which attendees explored opportunities for deeper museum-library collaborations.[60] The summit focused on increasing collaborative practices, shared, budget strategies, joint advocacy and advancement; and future GLAM sector summits.[61] While this paper does address scholarship and interdisciplinary research, it is in the context of collaboration efforts which support faculty and students using resources, not necessarily LIS professionals delving into the theory behind the materials. While it is possible LIS professionals could use these convergences as examples or case studies, the focus remains on convergence as a means to improve access, which is very much in line with the literature reviews statement that collaboration is driven by improved access for patrons. The paper in general seems to present convergence as a given for the involved institutions, and does not address how the convergence (or lack of convergence) of theory may have been influenced.

Collective Wisdom: An Exploration of Library, Archives and Museum Cultures is the result of a program sponsored by OCLC "which brought together 18 librarians, archivists and museum professionals to form a cohort charged with exploring cross-sector practices and culture with an eye toward increasing interdisciplinary collaborations and continuing education."[62] The cohort quickly

discovered that there are "both structural barriers to and multiple opportunities for collaboration, particularly in the arena of professional development and continuing education, but not exclusively so."[63] These professionals focused on conferences rather than journal publications, but still identified several ways that collaboration might be encouraged, including seeking scholarship outside the field, engaging in cross-sector scholarship, examining opportunities for joint memberships which lead to shared access to journals, and suggesting a wide variety of continuing education and professional development across sectors.[64] The report does not address the convergence of theory directly, but all of these recommendations can be seen as supporting a greater integration of theory between LAMs either directly (seeking scholarship outside the field) or by broadening professional identities to be more inclusive (continuing education and professional development activities).

The third paper, *Beyond the Silos of the LAMs* is a report generated by a project with three goals: "to explore the nature of library, archive and museum (LAM) collaborations, to help LAMs collaborate on common services and thus yield greater productivity within their institutions, and to assist them in creating research environments better aligned with user expectations."[65] This report is very user-focused (particularly in the area of combined digital collections as a means of improving access), but specifically argues that "LAM professionals who understand issues surrounding different types of collections and collecting institutions, and who are not rigidly wedded to their own professional traditions, bring an open-mindedness that allows them to embrace ideas from other professions in the interests of the collaboration."[66] The report suggests that this professional flexibility can be encouraged by deliberately learning from professionals in other fields, respecting values and traditions of other fields, and work that places individuals in close proximity to each other.[67] As in previous papers, distinct professional identity is seen as a barrier to convergence of LAMs, and the suggested solution is a broadening of professional identity.

The earliest material consulted concerned the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) symposium held in 2006: *Libraries, Archives, and Museums in the Twenty-First Century: Intersecting Missions, Converging Futures?*[68] A report describing the reactions of attendees of the conference echoed previous findings, noting the promise of providing access online to collections held by all three types of institutions, differences in professional practices, and one attendee reported that during her time in library school "even though the discourse presented among library scholars and professional publications recognized some overlap in the library, archives, and museum fields, they were often nebulous when it came to how these professions could actually work together and be, in a sense, amalgamated into a course of study or an academic program for budding stewards of our cultural heritage."[69] Although this conference took place eleven years ago, its findings are congruent with more modern reports: professional identity remains an obstacle to convergence.

To one extent or another, the need for continuing education and professional development across LAMs to aid in convergence is spoken of in these papers. This need was seen as urgent enough that OCLC issued the *National Agenda for Continuing Education and Professional Development across Libraries, Archives and Museums* in 2016.[70] This report focuses on continuing education and professional development, but it is reasonable to assume workshops would incorporate theory into what they're teaching either explicitly or implicitly. With the apparent resistance of some members of the archival profession to theory, it may also be beneficial to initially focus on practice in continuing education.

Of these papers, three discuss collaboration across institutions rather than convergence: *Collective Wisdom*; *Prospects and Strategies for Deep Collaboration*; and *Beyond the Silos of the LAMs*. This is an important but often unspoken distinction, as collaboration leaves room for professional identities and areas that do not overlap; however, semantically at least, convergence implies LAMs unifying and moving into one institution. Using the term convergence when referring to what is actually

collaboration creates the impression that continuing education and professional development will result in a merger of professional identities, but the presence of dual archivist/librarians suggests that such efforts may instead result in cross-trained individuals without the merger of theory or professional identity. It is unclear how cross-trained individuals would further convergence between institutions, but it could potentially lead to increased collaboration as more people are familiar with multiple standards, practices, and theory. This also follows the rationale laid out in the context of the literature review: LAMs as institutions converge and cooperate in exhibits, digital collections, and other user access points as well as budgets, while individuals collaborate and still maintain professional identities and practices. And if theory and scholarly publication is driven by individuals, not institutions, theory can remain separate as long as the individuals understand how different fields' theoretical contexts complement each other well enough to collaborate.

Conclusion

Overall, the literature review suggests that while libraries and archives may be converging in terms of digitization projects, exhibits, and finance, in other areas these institutions are not converging. Many professionals with duties associated with librarians and archivists view their jobs as split or dual positions. Archivists in particular do not always appear to engage heavily with theory even in their own profession once out of graduate school, and prefer to focus on practice. This presents a considerable barrier to integrating archival and library theory. The exact number of archivists who are tenure or non-tenure track is not known, but a 2017 study conducted by the Society of American Archivists' Women Archivists Section (WArS) found that of 1009 respondents 202 identified as tenure track, and 183 as non-tenure track faculty.[71] While archivists in other classifications certainly engage in scholarly discussions, faculty are more likely to have expectations that they publish and present as part of their job description, and be allotted critical assistance such as work time, travel funds, and other institutional support to do so. Increasing the number of archivists in faculty positions would result in a

greater numbers of archivists engaging in research, and one would hope theory although based on the literature review that research and subsequent publications might be more practice than theory driven.

The present study also suggests that in terms of theory, little convergence between libraries and archives is taking place. If that is the case, it implies that convergence may be happening in areas devoid of or at least not heavily influenced by theory; furthermore, if it is accepted that practice grounded in theory is at least partially what separates professional and non-professionals, this convergence may simply represent common areas of deprofessionalization in these fields. Does convergence driven by demand for convenient access have a use for theory, and if not, what does that say about our professional identities in a world which seems to take for granted that convergence is desirable if not a given? Does someone need to understand the concept of original order if patrons are simply going to sort digital images as they desire by the included metadata? Does *respect des fonds* apply if documents from a dozen OCR'ed collections are going to be searched simultaneously by keyword? The literature review identifies professional identity as a barrier to convergence, which given the lack of convergence of theory in the present findings can be interpreted as having some disturbing implications for the future of professional identity in archives and libraries if convergence (as opposed to collaboration) is inevitable.

The present research is not an attempt to sound an alarm against or even deny this convergence categorically, but rather an attempt to suggest that if theory remains important to us perhaps archivists, librarians, and museum curators should consider deliberate discussions regarding the professions' respective theoretical underpinnings and how they interact with each other in order to make convergence as productive as possible while maintaining (or forging new) professional identities. Archivists may also wish to have discussions regarding the importance of theory to the profession, and how practitioners can be encouraged to engage more deeply with theory after graduate school.

Professional development and continuing education are very sound beginnings for this goal and an excellent way to encourage collaboration, but at some point digging deeper will be necessary to see how theory in these fields interact with and complement each other. An obvious initial step here would be more active attempts to read and publish in journals in the other areas (for archivists particularly, the literature review suggests). Such discussions may also be a way to identify areas where collaboration may be possible, which, given the linked data environment on the horizon, may further benefit our institutions and our patrons. Evidence shows that the occurrence of citations between archival and library journals is rare between 2008 and 2016. Increasing these numbers would benefit both professions, although generating these kinds of discussion may represent a significant barrier to successful integration of libraries and archives. Overall, while effort to engage more broadly with theory and scholarly literature from professionals in other types of institutions may never result in a Grand Unified Theory of LAMs, it can lend additional perspectives to areas of convergence and increase collaboration, leading to a more nuanced, subtle view of how libraries, archives, and museums can better serve patrons.

---

[1] Valuable advice and critiques of this article were provided by Eric Childress, Cory Nimer, Christine Oliver, Pat Riva, Chad Kahl, Susan Franzen, and Alexandra Orchard. Errors remain the sole responsibility of the author.

[2] Roughly synonymous acronyms to refer to groups of cultural heritage institutions include GLAM (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums), and LAMMS (Libraries, Archives, Museums, Monuments and Sites).

[3] SNAC. About. http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/about.html; SNAC. Data Contributors. http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/datacontrib.html

[4] Oliver, Chris, et al. "Working Group on FRBR/CRM Dialogue." IFLA, June 8, 2014. https://www.ifla.org/node/928

[5] Jeanette A. Bastian, Megan Sniffin-Marinoff, and Donna Weber, *Archives in Libraries: What Librarians and Archivists Need to Know to Work Together* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2015), 117.

[6] Ibid., 117-118.

[7] Wendy Duff, et al. "From coexistence to convergence: studying partnerships and collaboration among libraries, archives, and museums," *Information Research*, volume 18, number 3, paper 585. http://InformationR.net/ir/18-3/paper585.html

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Jackie Dooley, *The Archival Advantage: Integrating Archival Expertise into Management of Born-digital Library Materials.* Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research, 2015: 5. http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2015/oclcresearch-archival-advantage-2015.pdf.

[11] Ibid., 24.

[12] Deanna Marcum, "Archives, Libraries, Museums: Coming Back Together?" *Information & Culture* 49, no. 1 (2014): 75.

[13] Ibid., 79.

[14] Ibid., 80.

[15] Kara Van Malssen, BIBFRAME AV Modeling Study, Defining a Flexible Model for Description of Audiovisual Resources," (2014): 2. http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/docs/pdf/bibframe-avmodelingstudy-may15-2014.pdf

[16] Ibid., 2.

[17] Ibid., 10.

[18] Fidelia Ibekwe-SanJuan and Elaine Ménard, "Preface: Archives, Libraries, and Museums in the Era of the Participatory Social Web," *Canadian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 39 no. 3/4 (September-December, 2015): 245.

[19] Ibid., 246.

[20] Ibid., 250.

[21] Cheryl Klimaszewski, "Lumping (and Splitting) LAMs: The Story of Grouping Libraries, Archives, and Museums," *Canadian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 39 no. 3/4 (September-December, 2015): 351.

[22] Ibid., 352.

[23] Ibid., 353.

[24] Ibid., 355.

[25] Ibid., 357.

[26] Society of American Archivists. "GPAS Curriculum." Society of American Archivists website. https://www2.archivists.org/prof-education/graduate/gpas/curriculum

[27] Academy of Certified Archivists. 2018 ACA Exam Application. https://certifiedarchivists.wufoo.com/forms/q11qi7kn1y8nbb7/

[28] Ann Wheeler, "A cataloger and an archivist: Katherine Ryner and St. Mary's College of Maryland," *College & Research Library News* 69, no. 7 (July-August, 2008): 390.

[29] Mary Manning and Judy Silva, "Dual Archivist/Librarians: Balancing the Benefits and Challenges of Diverse Responsibilities," *College & Research Libraries* (March 2012): 165-6.

[30] Ibid., 166.

[31] Ibid., 174.

[32] Cory L. Nimer, "Reading and Publishing within the Archives Community: A Survey," *The American Archivist* 72 (Fall/Winter, 2009): 318.

[33] Ibid., 319.

[34] Ibid., 321-2.

[35] Ibid., 323.

[36] Ibid., 325.

[37] John Roberts, "What is Archival Theory and Why is it Important? Responses to Terry Eastwood's Paper," *Archivaria* (Spring, 1994): 131.

[38] Kathleen Fear and Paul Conway. "Valuing the American Archivist: An Interpretation of SAA's First Readership Survey." The American Archivist 74, no. 2 (2011): 694.

[39] Fear and Conway,695.

[40] Laura Manzari, "Library and Information Science Journal Prestige as Assessed by Library and Information Science Faculty," *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 83 no. 1 (2013): 42.

[41] Ibid., 46-7.

[42] Allen, Stephanie, et al. 2017. Collective Wisdom: An Exploration of Library, Archives and Museum Cultures. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research. http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2017/collective-wisdom-white-paper.pdf

[43] Ibid., 7.

[44] Council Meeting Minutes. Society of American Archivists, May 16-17, 2017: SAA Headquarters, Chicago, Illinois: page 17. https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/0517%20Council%20Minutes_AsAdopted060817_0.pdf

[45] Future of ALA/SAA/AAM Joint Committee on Archives, Libraries and Museums (CALM). Society of American Archivists Council Meeting May 16-17, 2017: Chicago, Illinois, page 1. https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/0517-V-A-CALM.pdf

[46] Council Meeting Minutes, page 17.

[47] Jungfeng Xia, "Positioning Open Access Journals in a LIS Journal Ranking," *College & Research Libraries* (March, 2012): 135.

[48] Ibid., 139.

[49] Judith M. Nixon, "Core Journals in Library and Information Science: Developing a Methodology for Ranking LIS Journals," *College & Research Libraries* (January, 2014): 66.

[50] Ibid., 84.

[51] Ibid., 84.

[52] *American Archivist, Archival Issues, Archivaria, Journal of Archival Organization,* and *Provenance.* Nimer, "Reading and Publishing," 319.

[53] At the time of writing, *Journal of Archival Organization* had not published any issues after volume 12, 2014. See Taylor & Francis online. *Journal of Archival Organization*. http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/wjao20

[54] Published as the Journal of the Society of Archivists (1955-2012) and Archives and Records: The Journal of the Archives and Records Association (2013-).

[55] Alex H. Poole. "Archival Divides and Foreign Countries? Historians, Archivists, Information-Seeking, and Technology: Retrospect and Prospect." *The American Archivist* (Vol. 78, No. 2 Fall/Winter 2015): 375–433.

[56] Eric Willey. "Author page." ISU ReD: Research and eData. http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/do/search/?q=Eric%20Willey

[57] Citations for both the current and previous title were searched for in articles published from 2013-2016.

[58] Hea Lim Rhee, "Reflections on Archival User Studies." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (Summer 2015): 29-42.

[59] Stephanie Allen, et al., A6.

[60] Jill Deupi and Charles Eckman, "Prospects and Strategies for Deep Collaboration in the Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums Sector" (2016). Academic Art Museum and Library Summit (Coral Gables: January 2016). 1. http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/con_events_aamls2016/1

[61] Deupi and Eckman, 2.

[62] Stephanie Allen, et al. *Collective Wisdom: An Exploration of Library, Archives and Museum Cultures*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research, 2017, 6. http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2017/collective-wisdom-white-paper.pdf

[63] Allen, et al., page 6.

[64] Allen et al., page A6.

[65] Diane M. Zorich, Günter Waibel and Ricky Erway, *Beyond the Silos of the LAMs: Collaboration among Libraries, Archives, and Museums* (OCLC Research Publication, 2008), 8. www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2008/2008-05.pdf

[66] Zorich, Waibel, and Erway, page 27.

[67] Zorich, Waibel, and Erway, page 28.

[68] Christian Dupont. "Libraries, archives, and museums in the twenty-first century: Intersecting missions, converging futures?." RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage 8, no. 1 (2007), 13-19. http://rbm.acrl.org/index.php/rbm/article/view/271/271

[69] Dupont, 16-18.

[70] Christina Drummond, et al., editors 2016. *National Agenda for Continuing Education and Professional Development across Libraries, Archives and Museums*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research. http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2016/oclcresearch-national-agenda-lams-education-development-2016.pdf.

[71] Stacie Williams, Re: 2017 WArS/SAA Salary Survey question, email, 2017. These numbers are from the original raw data, and some responses may have been taken out during data cleaning (the survey did not specifically break down respondents by job classification, and this information was provided as a much appreciated courtesy to the author).