Theorizing Scholarship as Craft Pride in the LIS field

Elliott Kuecker
University of Georgia

Lydia Brambila
Valdosta State University

Abstract: This article applies the Marxist notion of craft pride, a sense of labor fulfillment that becomes lost in worker alienation, to argue that research and writing and publishing might resolve some of the malaise felt by many academic librarians in their work. Though publishing is an institutionalized practice, it can have transgressive value when viewed as a craft in which the creator has ownership over his/her work. At the crux of this discussion is the argument that scholarship in Library and Information Science (LIS) should move beyond only using quantitative and qualitative methods.

Researching and writing and publishing in the field of academic archiving or librarianship could

be a beneficial antidote (not solution) to two labor issues that are common in academic libraries: a

sense of general malaise related to feelings of emotional labor exhaustion, invisibility, being

underappreciated,[1] and the perception from academia that archivists and librarians are knowledge

keepers, protectors, and caregivers and not knowledge creators. While many others have written on

the topic of building a research culture in academic libraries[2], this piece focuses on the possibility that

the creation of scholarship connects to the Marxist notion of "craft pride" because it demands the labor

of writing, a task that can be thought of as a traditional craft, or rather, something one creates from

beginning to end that is owned through authorship. We suggest that a feeling of craft pride can come

from scholarly creation and thus respond to the psychic labor dimensions in our LIS work, while also

assisting in rewriting the notion that LIS workers do not create knowledge in a fashion that translates

to traditional academia. This article does not speak to the factors of funding or compensation that

impact the field of librarianship. Our recommendations regarding publishing and craft pride are not

---

[1] See Heidi Julien and Shelagh K. Genius, "Emotional Labour in Librarians' Instructional Work," *Journal of Documentation* 65 no. 6 (2009): 926-937; Kaetrene Davis Kendrick, "The Low Morale Experience of Academic Librarians: A Phenomenological Study," *Journal of Library Administration* 57 (2017): 846-878; Miriam L. Matteson and Shelly S. Miller, "Emotional Labor in Librarianship: a Research Agenda," Library and Information Science Research 32 (2012): 176-183; Miriam L. Matteson and Shelly Miller, "What Library Managers Should Know about Emotional Labor," *Public Library Quarterly* 33 (2014): 95-107; Lisa Sloniowski, "Affective Labor, Resistance, and the Academic Librarian," *Library Trends* 64 (2016): 645-666.

[2] See Joseph Fennewald, "Research Productivity Among Librarians: Factors Leading to Publication at Penn State," *College and Research Libraries* 69, no. 2 (2008): 104-116;Liz Walkley Hall, "From Practice to Research at Flingers University Library: Sustaining a Research Culture," *Library Management* (2018); Heidi LM Jacobs, Selinda Berg, and Dayna Cornwall, "Something to Talk About: Re-thinking Conversations on Research Culture in Canadian Academic Libraries," *Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research* 5, no. 2 (2010); Denise Koufogiannakis and Ellem Crumley. "Research in Librarianship: Issues to Consider," *Library High Tech* 24, no. 3 (2006): 324-340; Jose A. Montelongo, Lynne Gamble, and Navjit Brar, and Anita C. Hernandez. "Being a Librarian Isn't Enough: The Importance of Nonlibrary Research Agenda for the Academic Librarian: A Case Study," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 17, no. 1 (2010): 2-19.

intended to dismiss or replace conversations regarding systemic under-compensation in our field, nor do we intend to suggest that publishing be added as a requirement to librarians' lists of responsibilities. By focusing particularly on the psychic pleasure scholarship can offer one personally (not about how it might, for example, be beneficial to one's career), this paper problematizes the emphasis that the LIS field places on quantitative and qualitative methods of research and how this emphasis is an obstacle for those interested in doing other types of scholarship in LIS.

We begin by summarizing craft pride and its relationship to the foundational Marxist concept of alienation, an issue associated with industrial labor and capitalism that is prevalent in all labor that exists under capitalism, not just traditional notions of factory work. This idea speaks to general worker malaise, as well. We then provide some examples of the consequences that arise when LIS professions are perceived exclusively as knowledge protectors and not as knowledge creators, a role that readily leads to malaise. Finally, we describe the research that can take place in a variety of methodologies beyond the quantitative and qualitative in order to promote an interest in scholarship to those not interested in conducting studies of observable factors or phenomenological human experience.

Alienation and Craft Pride

"Craft" is a commonplace word often used to describe one's job in general, or a general task that requires skill. In this case, we refer to "craft" as a skilled act that exists outside of mass production, in particular the craft of "scholarship"—that is, writing and researching and publishing in the academic context. Although scholarship might refer to presenting, we exclude this from our definition of academic writing.

We acknowledge that there could be many issues with the suggestion that research and writing and publishing have the potential to produce psychic pleasure. Research and writing can take time that is often unavailable to academic workers (steal time to do it, we suggest). Research and writing are

still commodities to be traded in a capitalist-academic system. Publishing requires certain types of

mastery of language that some people have more than others given life circumstance (of course; this is

a different topic). Others view research and writing as punishment (yes; which is why we suggest that

we reframe it), and so on. In answer to these concerns, we propose the possibility that academic

writing can produce psychic pleasure because one might feel a sense of ownership over some part of

his or her job if she or he engages in researching and writing and publishing, as authorship is a unique

pleasure. This notion is inspired by the Marxist concept of "craft pride" and its potential to transgress

the feelings of alienation that are constructed by a capitalist work environment.

In Marx's economic writing, craft pride is a notion related to the foundational concept of

alienation in industrial labor (Marx, 1959; 1972); the notion of craft pride has a longer life in later Marxist

theory when scholars found other uses for it, though in general, Marxist theory tends to focus on the

concept of alienation more than it does craft pride. Alienation relates to Marx's formulation of how

worker exploitation functions on not only on a physical level, but also on a psychic level. Marx posits

that industrial labor separates the worker from the object he produces. He writes:

> Labour is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his essential being; that in his work,
> therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy,
> does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and mind. The
> worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself
> (Marx, 1959, p. 30)

In other labor systems outside of industrial labor, a craftsperson might create an object from

beginning to end, making the creator of the object, and the object itself, very attached. This

attachment to one's own creation fulfills the creator on a psychic level, making work useful because of

its function in achieving a sense of craft pride. In industrial labor, it is more advantageous to have

multiple people work on an object, each producing one small component of it, as "dividing the craft

cheapens its individual parts" (Cox, 1998, n.p). This structure dissolves a sense of creation in the creator and reduces the need for craft knowledge.

This estrangement operates also through the separation of the wage received for the task from the object that the task created. In libraries and factory work alike, the worker does not receive direct payment for producing an item. Marx writes, "Wages are, therefore, not the worker's share in the commodity produced by him. Wages are the part of already existing commodities with which the capitalist buys for himself a definite amount of productive labour power" (Marx, 1972, p. 170). A worker is paid for labor a chunk of time spent performing labor, not for the individual items he might produce, as was more common of pre-capitalist economic arrangements.

The alienation a worker may feel from the object they produce is wildly destructive. The skills once needed to make something from beginning to end are not needed, diminishing the intellectual and creative labor that might otherwise arise from the task. The nature of mechanization of labor wreaks havoc on the body, as machines came to play an increasingly important role in production in capitalist society (a theme we know very well). "Craft pride," then, is one of the intangible qualities that is lost in industrial labor. Cox (1998) explains,

> A living being which has once begun to make nature his own through the work of his hands, his intellect, and his imagination, will never stop. Every achievement opens the door to unconquered territory… But when labour is destructive, not creative, when it is undertaken under coercion and not as the free play of forces, when it means the withering, not the flowering, of man's physical and intellectual potential, then labour is a denial of its own principle and therefore the principle of man (n.p.) .

This alienation digs further, still, as the object produced is owned by the brand, not the worker, meaning the worker is not involved in deciding what happens to that object and how. The worker is separated from seeing the life of the object, or, as Cox (1998) explains:

> Men no longer enjoyed the right to dispose of what they produced how they chose: they became separated from the product of their labour … workers considered themselves masters

of what they produced. It took great repression, a 'judicial onslaught', in the late 18th century to convince them that what they produced belonged exclusively to the capitalist who owned the factories (n.p).

Cox's (1998) use of "masters" is essential here, as she describes that a sense of self-ownership is replaced by a sense of being owned, and this ownership is validated and policed through legal systems.

To be clear, Marx did not wish for the labor system to reverse itself and begin to embrace craft again; essentialist Marxism has other goals related to a different, more revolutionary future, sometimes conceived of as utopian. Later Marxists have noticed, however, that "craft pride" as a concept has useful applications to contemporary labor. Byrne (1990) writes, when discussing the idea of "meaningful work," that "work for some people is a way of exercising craftsmanship. Work so conceived can be very fulfilling. But, says Michael Maccoby, this way of working, what he calls a 'craft ethic,' is dead and gone, having given way to the wizardry of the entrepreneur" (Byrne, 1990, p. 70). In other words, "craft pride" refers very specifically to the act of creation and does not simply refer to having pride in one's work (as most jobs are not crafts). Byrne (1990) asks, "Should a workers' representative agree that, as long as there is work to be done, it ought to be as meaningful as possible to the worker? Or might the quest for meaning lead to another dragon's lair?" (p. 113). Here, he wonders whether workers should seek to find ways to make work meaningful and fulfilling, or if we should see notions of meaningful work as fulfilling the capitalist's desire for us to be self-disciplined through an internalized motive, such as "work ethic" (another troubling concept that some argue reinforces capitalism, while others argue it is more inherent to humans[3]).

Indeed, it could be a myth that meaningful work was "the rule until capitalism came along to upset the good old ways, deskill self-actualizing craftspersons, and reduce the workforce to cogs in the

---

[3] See Max Weber's seminal work, *The Protestant Work Ethic*

wheels of corporate progress (Byrne, 1990, p. 113), but even if the flaws of a pre-capitalist society could

justify a modern capitalist one, this would still not discount the benefits of craft pride. As Cox (1998)

says, it is also "inimical to many forms of art, for example because of division of labour, the

mechanization of many forms of human activity, and the predominance of quantitative over

qualitative concerns" (n.p.) Many of these problems are the result of the wide adoption of the industrial

labor model, and these problems are essential to the function of capitalism. In fact, craft and even craft

capital is being circulated as a comfort in our own time; Jakob and Tomas (2017) write:

> The more technology, mass-production and mass-consumption takes people away from
> tangible experiences, the more craft and crafts communities are galvanized due to their
> physical and psychological comforts. The craft's ethos lies in its 'long history of resistant to
> both the industrial revolution and the general tendency of technology and capitalism to
> replace the more genuine and authentic forms of human production, name, the things made
> by hand' (p. 501).

Craft has power to it, then, as both a "craft pride" psychic pleasure, and a tangible resistance to

industrial capitalism and often, the technosphere.

Marx's notions of alienation from the object of production and around craft pride have critical

potential to address the two related labor issues identified earlier: the notions of malaise and the

commonplace idea that librarians are knowledge protectors and not knowledge creators. These two

issues work in tandem, as the latter feeds many of the feelings of the former. What cannot be

emphasized enough is that in order for researching and writing and publishing to truly achieve craft

pride, we must write about what we want to learn and use whichever methods we want to use for

analysis. We criticize specifically the heavy emphasis in LIS on "evidence-based" quantitative or

qualitative methods. Labaree (2012) argued, in reference to educational research, that:

> Without a larger meaning and purpose, educational research constitutes just another form of
> alienated labor… workers sell their labor to an employer who then controls their time and
> owns what they produce during their time… Assembly line workers are renting their hands, but
> their minds are free… Alienated scholars are renting their minds. They are harnessing their

consciousness to the meaningless tasks of doing research and publishing papers… If you are going to pursue a scholarly career, therefore, you need to figure out what makes such a pursuit intrinsically worthy (pp. 78-79).

So, a research culture in general is not our interest, as it is problematic when it only works to serve the system; this paper explores what makes scholarship intrinsically worthy to the writer.

Knowledge Protectors and Knowledge Creators

Librarians and archivists have distinct job tasks but share a similar vocational history that positions both as knowledge protectors and not knowledge creators. While it is true that an essential component of many of our jobs is protecting knowledge—and we include in this definition also the act of collecting knowledge— it is also true that this is not a task that is mutually exclusive to that of creating knowledge. As Terry Cook (2013) notes, "archivists have traditionally been about acquiring, describing, and preserving documents as evidence, protecting their impartiality through the archivists' self-conscious stance of neutrality and objectivity" (p. 97). Cook (2013) also notes that notions like "memory" or "identity" are complicated and non-neutral. Even the task of deciding what is of value or importance is complicated, as it involves "cultural, political, symbolic, emotional, and ethical imperatives" that are central to "power, identity, and privilege" (Cook, 2013, p. 101). He writes that archivists once were and still sometimes are "passive keepers of an entire documentary residue left by creators," but that they are actually "active shapers of archival heritage… continual mediators between past, present, and future" (Cook, 2013, p. 102). Even in Cook's (2013) "modern archival paradigm," archivists who are engaged in some historiographically-informed archival arrangements, are still seen as "handmaidens of historians" (p. 102). They merely serve to fetch the objects and archival documents that were born in the archive, waiting to be discovered.

Within Cook's (2013) description of archival paradigms is the notion that there is inherent quality of creation in archiving. Creation involves creative and intellectual processes, but this style of

creation still renders one a handmaiden to a historian, as the historian is one who will actually write

the narrative the archival evidence will bolster, though those of us in LIS know that there is a narrative

already there before the historian moves to interpretation. Cook's (2013) theory is validated in

scholarship from other fields that discuss the act of archival research from a scholar's perspective. For

example, an anthropologist writing about her use of the archive writes, "Archival labor makes one

attend differently to reference within documents and cross reference between them. It trains our

analytic sensibilities on placement and the arts of culling and cribbing. It trains one to be attentive to

verbal tense, to track how histories are made, fixed, and rewritten in the process of 'merely' reporting

on an event"(Stoler, 2015, p. 156). Importantly, in this conception "archival labor" is the labor the

scholar performs in going into the archive, while in our field we would call "archival labor" the job of

the actual archivist. This description is a fascinating dialectic: Stoler (2015)is noting that the scholar

must not maintain a neutral status of merely reporting an event, and must pay close attention to how

history is constructed, but in the same breath, is referring to the archival arrangement provided for the

scholar as a neutral place, as if it has not already been sorted through by someone. The archivist's

intellectual tasks are invisible to the scholar, and in fact, everything about the archivist is invisible.

In librarianship, it is a similar story. A good example is one from a recent Princeton University

Press book, *Keywords for further Consideration and Particularly Relevant to Academic Life, especially*

as it Concerns Disciplines, Inter-disciplinary Endeavor, and Modes of Resistance to the Same, in which

the authors write in the "bibliography" entry:

> Thus the bibliographer may reveal an author's omissions, secrets, and blind spots, no less than
> his/her considerable erudition; indeed, it may reveal that the work fails to produce knowledge
> over and against the texts in the bibliography itself. In this case, the truest bibliographer would
> be the librarian, who pledges to care for knowledge rather than make it (A Community of
> Inquiry, 2018, p. 6)

This is a fun and somewhat catty book about academic life and norms, and several entries therein contain provocative commentary. We are interested here in the authors' assertion that the librarian would be the best bibliographer because of his/her ability to interact with text in a neutral way. Indeed, while librarianship can be cultish, the act of "pledging" to interact with knowledge in a way that does not interpret it would position the librarian's profession not only as deeply neutral (a point that is highly contested by many librarians), but almost explicitly anti-intellectual.

Although the history of librarianship is outside the purview of this discussion, it is worth noting that some reasons that scholars would see librarians and archivists as disengaged from the scholarly creation process have to do with its gendered history—how the field was professionalized, sexism related to what is "women's work" and the history of gender in the field (such as saying we "care" for knowledge, in a maternal sense), the rhetoric of neutrality from earlier library literature, the emphasis on building bibliographies and lists (some still think those are neutral, too), and so on. But currently, this type of scholarly invisibility could be problematic when many of us are on strange, morphed tenure-tracks, in the liminal space of faculty-equivalent, faculty-status, and other mutations of the academic world. While there is an intellectual process that takes place in arrangement and description, organization, in cataloging, or in instruction, it is nevertheless difficult to present these tasks as intellectual creations that are integral to the academic institution, which is largely composed of bodies of work that include writing and researching and publishing. Producing scholarly writing is thus a tangible and recognizable creation of knowledge in this context.

Most standard library or archival tasks fit within Marxist notions of a worker alienated from the object produced, or cause malaise related to the way in which the work does not result in a direct benefit for the worker, but a benefit for the system that employs the worker. Reference services can either result in rewarding human interactions or in hours spent helping someone else do something

successfully while being treated poorly. Digitization jobs can feel like factory work, with hours spent scanning and editing things at the expense of one's body's comfort and with no real ownership over the end product. Library instruction can feel rewarding, but most library instruction still takes place in single session, meaning the interpersonal relationships that teachers normally form with their students are replaced with constantly meeting classes of strangers, like the first day of school over and over again. Library programs can feel like personal creations, but they are ephemeral and often hinge on the patron's participation as markers of success. Assessment tasks cannot easily speak to the intangible and emotional labors of the field, and more so, assessment culture as it stands now often deems a result as successful or effective through the judgement of how much someone else liked it, how much someone else learned, and not how the worker felt about it.

The ideal reference interaction is itself a commodity packaged to facilitate -- and not problematize -- the research being conducted by others. As Marx (1959) notes, "The worker becomes all the poorer the more wealth he produces, the more his production increases in power and size. The worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more commodities he creates"(p. 28). In a similar fashion, the reference librarian, much like a good teacher, "is in the business of making himself or herself unnecessary, of empowering learners to learn without the teacher's help" such that the patron might diminish their own position as an authority in order to enhance the patron's ability to independently navigate library systems (Labaree, 2000, p. 233).

For those who might embrace the notion of engaging in research and writing and publishing as a craft, then, we might resolve two issues at once: (1) they will engage in knowledge creation in a manner that others can see in a way that translates to the academic world, and (2) they can achieve a sense of craft pride through authorship and by transgressing the boundary from knowledge protector to knowledge creator. We selected research and writing and publishing specifically because it

comprises a craft. If Marx's description of the psychic pleasure that arises from the objects of our

creation is accurate, the author will gain a sense of pleasure through the ownership of their piece of

writing. But, as we have said previously, this sense of pleasure requires that the task at hand is one the

worker wishes to take on according to their own rules. An integral part of process is learning precisely

what we want to learn about through research and writing, and then engaging with that topic of

inquiry with our desired method. This is, in LIS, sometimes impossible because of the intense cultural

capital granted to quantitative and qualitative methods in our field and the frequent dismissal or

misunderstanding of all other methods, many of which are more linked to humanities traditions than

social science traditions. As David Hudson (2017) notes,

> It is practicality in the popular sense of the word that is central to the library world. We
> organize and administer things. … We emphasize efficiency, brevity, speed. We save the time
> of the user, to paraphrase Ranganathan's fourth law of library science. No nonsense. Get on
> with it so you can get it done. Library service without friction, to repurpose Bill Gates's
> capitalist imagery (p. 206).

> In a world of interdisciplinary research, the lines along which academic research is conducted

are increasingly blurred, but our own field remains militantly opposed to interdisciplinary research that

contains no "empirical evidence" to support their writing. Hudson (2017) continues,

> It is difficult to undertake the slow, messy practice of unpacking foundational assumptions —
> and their material implication in the dispossessive violence of existing social, political, and
> economic arrangements — where one's environment is governed by expectations of efficiency,
> directness, brevity, speed. *Don't waste your time with questions for which there are no*
> *answers, with work that does not lead to improved productivity and measurable successes.*
> *Research is about results.* Research without the drag of disrupted conceptual bases. Research
> without friction (p. 212).

Like so many other institutional academic entities, libraries are increasingly vulnerable to the

pressures of capitalism (Clark, 2009), and the field's inability to adapt to the world of critical theory that

is explored in parallel disciplines (Brown, 2011) negatively impact libraries' ability to support the

institution as a whole.

Opening up Methodology

The sense of craft pride one might feel for their scholarship arises from the ability to complete a research project that is deeply attached to one's personal interests. Labaree (2011) explains that "a close look at how scholars actually carry out their craft reveals that they generally thrive on frustration" (p. 196), meaning the thing worth studying is the thing that nags you personally. Conducting research with human subjects can be labor-intensive, ethically fraught, and fundamentally unsound. Problematically, in LIS, it can be impossible to research what we want, and more so, how we want, as the field still emphasizes quantitative and qualitative research studies as the only research methods worth publishing, leaving the worlds of critique, theory, argument, and other humanities-centered style writing (and obviously not to mention the world of post-humanities writing) as non-options. The majority of the journals in our field do not accept writing if it is neither positivist nor phenomenological, but some do,[4] and of course, thousands do in other disciplines. Even in the small list of journals where theory and critique is embraced, it is almost exclusively theories from the critical pedagogy canon, while other things associated with the postmodern turns are very unlikely to be considered for publication. In an effort to legitimize the field as a science, its arbiters delegitimize other avenues of inquiry that could provide a space for craft pride for those who feel limited by quantitative and qualitative methods, much less particular philosophical schools.

---

[4] Archivaria; The American Archivist; Counterpoise (until 2011); In the Library with a Lead Pipe; Library History; Information & Culture: A Journal of History; Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies; Journal of New Librarianship; Progressive Librarian are examples of journals that accept or prefer methods other than qualitative and quantitative.

In our field, quantitative and qualitative are vested with the most cultural capital, leaving other methods under- or unrepresented. Additionally, the journals with the most cultural capital in our field are those which validate quantitative and qualitative methods as the methods with the most cultural capital, making it very difficult to shift the emphasis. In other social sciences, such as education, ongoing discourse embraces the fact that reading, writing, and applying critical theory (rather than performing a study) is a necessary task that problematizes fundamental assumptions in the field and can result in radical repositionings of inquiry. As Giroux (1998) writes in *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning*:

> Just as a country distributes goods and services, what can be labeled as material capital, it also distributes and legitimates certain forms of knowledge, language practices, values, modes of style, and so forth, or what gets labeled as high status knowledge in the schools and universities and, thus, provide legitimacy to certain forms of knowledge and social practices (p. 5).

To use this article as an meta-example, its method is largely a Marxist critique using interdisciplinary sources, which allows for inquiry that is distinct from the approach of, say, a quantitative study on how many academic librarians publish articles each year (which would be a number that would still require critical interpretation), or a qualitative study gathering personal experiences of academic librarians who publish (which would only provide room to make sense of human subjectivity). In a case like this one, Marxist theory facilitates the creation of a critical space to think about labor and the particular pleasures lost in capitalist labor as they apply to the LIS field. At no point are we studying human subjects or speaking to human subjects in order to do this kind of research, as the end goal is not to shine a light on any one person's or group of people's life experience, but rather to critique an institution that exists within capitalism and how workers within it can feel better about their work (particularly since not working is not an option for most of us). It is made more marginal by the fact that Marx is not being used to discuss monetary exchange, class relations, nor

intersectionality related to labor value, but rather the psychic elements of work that could be aided

through a new narrative of an extremely traditional solution, but does so without touching on

emotional or affective labor, which are currently popular in LIS discussions of labor, making it nearly

unpublishable within the field because of its lack of cultural capital. This just serves as an example of

how one cannot easily research what he or she wants to research unless the dominant and sub-

dominant paradigms accommodate it.

There are very real reasons that quantitative and qualitative methods dominate many

academic fields, and this critique is intended to suggest they have become dogmatic, not that they are

useless, as they are often useful. In the performance of scientism in librarianship, quantitative methods

allow for empirical evidence, and qualitative methods allow for that which is inarguable: a real

person's life experience. Both of these are stable; no one can accuse the researcher of being wrong or

terribly controversial for asking people questions or doing a study to gather data related to the habits

and preferences of others. Labaree (2011) makes note of this in his field of education, writing:

> Becoming a scholar is not easy under the best of circumstances, and we may make
> it even harder by trying to imbue emerging scholars with a dedication for getting
> things right… we stress the importance of rigorous research methods and study design,
> scrupulous attribution of ideas, methodical accumulation of data, and cautious validation of
> claims. Being careful to stand on firm ground methodologically in itself is not a bad thing for
> scholars, but trying to be right all the time can easily make us overly cautious, encouraging us
> to keep so close to our data and so far from controversy that we end up saying nothing that's
> really interesting (p. 196).

In a different piece, Labaree (2012) claims: "Trying to be right can get scholars in trouble. Too often it

leads them to work so hard to avoid being wrong that they end up being boring… The thing to keep in

mind here is that for scholars the function of writing is to work out complex intellectual problems that

you can't resolve in your head"(p. 78), which is, of course, the ultimate aim of writing as inquiry, a

practice we would think our field should embrace.

In summary, research conducted in the LIS field reveals a pervasive sense of malaise in academic librarianship, particularly when related to emotional labor and a lack of professional validation. Further, evidence from other fields reveals that librarians and archivists are not considered creators of knowledge by peers in academia and instead are seen as keepers, protectors, and caregivers, passive in their support of active research and creation. The tasks of keeping, protecting, and caring are necessary, but it is often not even possible to merely keep, protect, and care; nor is it desirable to many who find themselves in faculty-status positions within a paradigm that comes with a long tradition of a very specific type of knowledge creation. These labor issues in the LIS field tangle together and limit librarians' potential.

Further, Marxist critiques of worker alienation under capitalism reveal the ways in which work separates us from our creations to the point that the labor results not in "creations" but rather "products" that largely benefit the system more than the worker. Craft pride arises when a one is invested in the creation of something from beginning to end, possesses decision making power in what happens to it, exercises control over their own creative and intellectual processes, and, ultimately, when one can put their name on the object. We suggest that, in producing scholarly work through research and writing and publishing, one might create new knowledge that could fulfill craft pride in authorship while also serving as a translatable symbol of intellectual creation to others, which addresses both a psychic and a material labor problem. As a field, we must expand the methodologies acceptable to the LIS field to make space for scholarly creations outside of quantitative and qualitative methods, which dominate our field but have limitations in creating new knowledge and can impede the potential for new critical approaches in research.

References

Byrne, E. F. (1990). *Work, INC.: A philosophical inquiry.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

A Community of Inquiry. (2018). *Keywords for further consideration and particularly relevant to*

academic life, especially as it concerns disciplines, inter-disciplinary endeavor, and modes of

resistance to the same, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, W. (2011). Neoliberalized knowledge. *History of the Present, 1* (1), 113-129.

Clark, S. (2009, Summer). Marketing the library?: Why librarians should focus on stewardship and

advocacy," *Progressive Librarian*, *33*, 93-100.

Cook, T. (2013). Evidence, memory, identity, and community: Four shifting archival paradigms,"

Archival Science 13 (2-3), 95-120.

Cox, J. (1998). An introduction to Marx's theory of alienation. *International Socialism, 79.*

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning.* Amherst, MA:

Bergin and Garvey Publishing.

Hudson, D. J. (2017). The whiteness of practicality, in G. Schlesselman-Tarango (Ed.), *Topographies of*

whiteness: Mapping whiteness in library and information studies (pp. 203-234). Sacramento,

CA: Library Juice Press.

Jakob, D. & Thomas., N. J. (2017). Firing up craft capital: The renaissance of craft and craft policy in the

United Kingdom. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 23* (4), 495-511.

Labaree, D. F. (2011). Adventures in scholarship. In W. Urban (Ed.), *Leaders in the historical study of*

American education (pp. 193-204). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Labaree, D.F. (2012). A sermon on educational research.*" Bildungsgeschichte: International Journal for*

the Historiography of Education 2, (1), 78-87.

Labaree, D. F. (2000, May/June). On the nature of teaching and teacher education: Difficult practices

that look easy." *Journal of Teacher Education, 51* (3), 228-233.

Marx, K. (1972). Wage labour and capital. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels reader*. New York: W.W.

    Norton & Company.

Marx, K. (1959). *Economic & philosophic manuscripts of 1844.* Translated by Martin Milligan, revised by

    Dirk J. Struik, and proofed and corrected by Matthew Carmody. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

    Retrieved from the Marxist Internet Archive at

    https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Economic-Philosophic-

    Manuscripts-1844.pdf

Stoler, A. (2015). On archival labor: Refracting colonial history, *Paginas 46* (2015): 153-165.