This paper explores how historians acknowledge librarians and archivists in scholarly publications. The acknowledgement sections of 114 books in women’s history were examined using content analysis. Historians mention experiencing companionship during lonely research trips, benefiting from research advice, and observing seemingly miraculously feats of reference in their interactions with librarians and archivists. The findings suggest that researchers of women’s history interact with librarians and archivists on a personal level, and as peers and as patrons. This study supports previous research on historians’ belief in the unique abilities of librarians and archivists to benefit the historical research process.

Headings:

- Dedications in books, periodicals, etc. – Content analysis
- Historical literature
- Archivists
- Librarianship as a profession
PERSONAL, PEER, PATRON: SCHOLARLY INTERACTIONS WITH LIBRARIANS AND ARCHIVISTS IN THE ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS OF WOMEN’S HISTORY BOOKS

by
Sarah A. Forzetting

A Master’s paper submitted to the faculty of the School of Information and Library Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina
April 2010

Approved by

Helen R. Tibbo
TABLE OF CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION** 2

**PURPOSE** 5

**LITERATURE REVIEW** 7

- Studies of information needs and behavior 7
- Studies of acknowledgements 11

**METHOD** 15

- Sample 17
  - Characteristics of the Sample 19
- Coding Scheme 23

**FINDINGS** 24

**DISCUSSION** 27

- Personal Interactions 27
- Peer Interaction 28
- Patron Interactions 29

**CONCLUSION** 30

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** 35

**APPENDIX** 38
“...grossly underpaid and underappreciated—[reference librarians at a state archive] should be forced to stand for prolonged applause at all gubernatorial state-of-the-state speeches—they spend hours each day running from pillar to post searching for obscure items needed by researchers. If you need anything else, ‘just call or email’ seems to be a mantra they've developed over the years. Amazingly, they mean it...[they] always seem to be willing to drop whatever they're doing to help hapless researchers locate impossibly small but massively important documents.”¹

**INTRODUCTION**

The above quote was written by a professor of history and comes from the acknowledgement section of her third book on women’s history.² It is the opening to several paragraphs of thanks to the librarians who assisted in locating the materials upon which the book is based. But more than just a statement of public recognition for services rendered, these three sentences offer insight into the relationship between historians and library and archive professionals.³

In this acknowledgment, the historian recognizes a core function of the librarian or archivist is to make documents available to researchers. It is also evident that the historian felt the need to differentiate between the important service and her own position as an “hapless” outsider who must rely on the willingness of the archivist to “run from pillar to post” and find those “impossibly small but massively important documents.”⁴

The comment reveals the difficult nature of conducting research in an archive or special collection where the stacks are closed and the only way to access information is through the library or archive staff. Such collections are mainly described through finding aids.
that index materials at the box or sometimes folder level, but have little information on individual documents. The archivists who process collections are often the only ones who know the particulars of a special library or archive’s holdings. To historians, who have only seen the finding aid and who are unable to say exactly which documents are applicable to their research topic, the ability of the librarian or archivist to assess a topic and produce the perfect document can appear to be a somewhat supernatural feat.

By describing the librarians as “grossly underpaid and underappreciated” and exaggerating their need for praise, the historian could be alluding to some discomfort with the fact that historians are so fully dependent on the knowledge and assistance of special collections librarians and archivists. If nothing else, the quote suggests that the relationship between historians and librarians and archivists is anything but transparent.

The relationship between historians and archivists has been described as critical for historical research, as historians rely on the primary sources that librarians and archivists acquire, preserve, describe and present. In the early 20th century, historians were closely aligned with the archive profession and were often the creators and managers of repositories for historical documents. With the professionalization of the disciplines of history, archivy, and librarianship, the role of historians in the management of archives was diminished as archives were increasingly organized by scientific methods and materials were preserved not just for the research agendas of historians, but for the public as a whole. The shift from repositories kept for the purposes of historical research to archives purposed for preservation and public use meant that historians (along with anyone who wanted to conduct research) had to relinquish some control over his or her personal research agenda and agree to abide by the rules of the archive and consent to
surveillance in exchange for the privilege of having materials preserved, managed and
protected by librarians and archivists.\textsuperscript{7}

A recent study by Catherine Johnson and Wendy Duff suggests that historians
purposefully seek out positive relationships with archivists, hoping to gain special access
to invisible material known only to the archivist and expecting to profit from the
archivist’s insight into the types, organization and whereabouts of materials appropriate
for their research.\textsuperscript{8} Johnson and Duff conclude that the relationship between historians
and archivists can be viewed as social capital that has to be earned, cultivated over time,
and eventually repaid through special acknowledgement in the historian’s publication.

The few studies of historians from the literature in the library and archive
profession have focused mainly on sources historians use and cite,\textsuperscript{9} on how the library
and archive’s tools and services are used,\textsuperscript{10} and on historians’ methodology and research
process.\textsuperscript{11} Johnson and Duff’s study identified a gap in this literature where the
relationship between archivists and historians had been often noted, but not studied in any
depth.\textsuperscript{12}

The acknowledgements sections of scholarly publications have been examined
recently as way to gauge the social relations between researchers and those they
recognize as contributing to their research. Acknowledgements have been discussed as a
form of patronage in scholarly communication, where the reality of the past may be
purposefully glossed over and where the author could be looking toward the possibility of
receiving future favors. In this way, acknowledgements indicate “a world of
dependency,” where a “web of interpersonal debts” is revealed and where the success of
a scholar depends on contributions and assistance from other professions.\textsuperscript{13}
Acknowledgements have also been described as carrying “metamessages” about the social hierarchy of a discipline, a place where the author can indirectly criticize or express discomfort with his or her own status in that hierarchy.\(^\text{14}\)

Acknowledgements are also the only place in scholarly literature where the contributions of students, editors, librarians and archivists, or family and friends are cited.\(^\text{15}\) As such, acknowledgements can be explored as a way to gain a more nuanced understanding of the scholarly culture of a particular discipline.

Only a few studies of acknowledgements written by historians exist. Blaise Cronin included acknowledgements from the *American Historical Review*, a top history journal, in his study of acknowledgement patterns in the humanities and social sciences.\(^\text{16}\) Laurie Scrivener has also studied historians’ acknowledgement patterns, limiting her study to history dissertations written at the University of Oklahoma.\(^\text{17}\) There appear to be no studies of acknowledgements in history books, even though the production of scholarly monographs is considered to be central to the discipline of history.\(^\text{18}\) Moreover, there have been no studies of acknowledgements of librarians or archivists in the literature of any discipline.

**PURPOSE**

This paper seeks to address the absence of research on the relationship between historians and librarians and archivists in library and archival literature, as well as to contribute to the literature on acknowledgements by providing an example from the field of history. To that end, this paper explores how historians acknowledge librarians and archivists in scholarly monographs. The acknowledgement sections of 114 books in women’s history were examined using content analysis to look for commonalities in how
historians describe the work of librarians and archivists, how historians view their relationship with librarians and archivists, and what services and characteristics are commonly highlighted.

Women’s history is a broadly defined field within the discipline of history, and one that is not constrained by geographic region, periodization or methodological approach. As such, women’s history books can represent a broad range of fields and specialties within the discipline of history. Women’s history is a relatively new field (unlike political history, for example) in the discipline of history and its development has called attention to the fact that archival documents are not well indexed for topics relating to women.\(^{19}\) Interdisciplinary approaches are necessary for locating materials on women in history, and the expertise of librarians and archivists in knowing the content of various collections becomes quite important in this context. Women’s history acknowledgements have the potential to show how scholars working in interdisciplinary subjects interact with librarians and archivists.

The findings suggest that researchers of women’s history interact with librarians and archivists on a personal level, and as peers and patrons. Experiencing companionship during lonely research trips, benefiting from research advice, and observing seemingly miraculously feats of reference are some of the ways in which historians describe interactions with librarians and archivists. The analysis of historians’ acknowledgments support Johnson and Duff’s conclusion that relationships with librarians and archivists are considered valuable assets in the research process and that historians would likely benefit from increased interaction with these information professionals.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review discusses some of the ways that library and archival literature on the disciplinary culture of historians has referred to the relationship between librarians and archivists and historians. The first section deals with studies on the information needs and behaviors of historians. The second section describes studies of acknowledgements in the humanities.

Studies of information needs and behavior

Library and archive professionals have long been interested in the disciplinary cultures of the academics they serve, recognizing that a better understanding of discipline-specific information needs and behaviors can contribute to improved services. Although history is often included in broader studies of the humanities or social sciences, there are a few studies that focus specifically on the discipline of history. These studies come mainly from the perspective of archival use and services and most rely on interviews and surveys with history professors to explore the nature of historical research, how it is carried out, what sources and tools historians use, and how sources are located.

The goal of historical research is to reconstruct the past through the analysis and interpretation of artifacts of the past. Donald O. Case interviewed 20 historians (only one woman) at 8 universities to determine historians’ motivations and methods for research. He found that historians “read, condense, collect, assimilate, transform, and synthesize written records of the past” in order to contribute to a dialogue among other historians about different views of the past, to bring new sources or questions to light in order to provoke new research, or to recreate a particular moment or place in history. To
do this, Case found, historians must examine a variety of original sources housed in a “bewildering” array of libraries and archives.²¹

The physical and emotional experience of doing research in an archive were what historians discussed most in interviews with Barbara Orbach concerning their conceptions of historical research. Historians described their research as a process of struggling to “untie knots” and becoming “wrapped up” in the materials with which they work. Historical research was described as a solitary, lonely and uncomfortable process, sitting for long hours in libraries and archives searching for a single “nugget” that would make a day of reading worthwhile.²² Orbach also found that historians relied heavily on the repository staff. They also emphasized the ability of the archivists to make important intellectual connections in their work. The historians, in Orbach’s view, attributed a great deal of power to archivists in the initial stages of their research, noting the need to be nice to archivists so that the trip to the archive would be pleasant and successful.²³ Orbach suggested that greater efforts should be made to introduce history students to library and archival principles and that archivists should continue to stay abreast of developments within the field of history.

Archivists were also identified as playing a strong role in the four types of behavior Wendy Duff and Catherine Johnson noted in their study of how 10 mid-career historians conducted research in archives.²⁴ The four types of information-seeking behavior that arose from their analysis of interview transcripts are: orienting oneself to the archive; seeking known material; building contextual knowledge; and identifying relevant material. The historians in this study recognized archivists as the authors of collections and therefore purposefully talked to them in the orienting stage, although the
archivists’ knowledge came into play and was utilized in all four stages. Archivists were seen as knowing the contents of collections (including uncatalogued collections), how a specific collection could be applied to the research topic, and how to connect the research topic to a variety of collections. Archivists were also cited as having a unique knowledge of local history.

The idea that historians’ deliberately establish relationships with archivists as a research strategy was further explored by Johnson and Duff in a study that combined the interview method with an analysis of research diaries kept by 10 PhD students. The study sought to understand historians’ motivations for engaging with archivists. The first motivation they found was tied to the historians’ desire to tap the knowledge of the archivist. Similar to the findings in their previous study, Johnson and Duff found that historians felt that the ability to access the unique knowledge of archivists was equivalent to being able to access sources. A second motivation had to do with the view of the archivist as a gatekeeper. The historians in this study believed that having a “less-than-good” relationship with the archivist could hamper their ability to get access to sources. Respondents reported feeling that they were at the mercy of the archivists who had the power to deny them access to special sources. On the other hand, gaining the trust and respect of the archivist was seen as guaranteeing good service in the future. One of the main strategies used in establishing a good relationship was “chatting up the archivist.”

Johnson and Duff found that historians in the early stages of their career were more concerned with the necessity of cultivating a relationship with the archivist. Whereas more experienced researchers recognized the benefit of good relationships with archivists in their own work, novice historians were still trying to figure out how to
establish and present their identity as credible scholars to archivists. Johnson and Duff, like Orbach, recommended archivists make an effort to engage with and foster relationships with novice historians.

Interviews that Roberto Delgadillo and Beverly P. Lynch conducted with history graduate students showed that fledging historians were advised by their professors to get to know subject bibliographers and librarians in special collections. In their use of the library at the early stages of their education, graduate students said they were encouraged to learn to self-discover and work on their own. However, they noted that after a few years they relied more on special collections and archives, which meant being highly dependent on the expertise of the staff for finding appropriate materials. Delgadillo and Lynch also noted that history graduate students recognized that the process of information-seeking, including talking to experts, was often as important to their studies as the information itself.

Margaret Stieg Dalton and Laurie Charnigo’s study of the information sources historians’ use suggests that those in the early stages of their careers rely more heavily on materials in special collections and archives. While only part of their study correlated the researcher’s age with opinions and use of materials, it found that as historians advanced in their careers they believed primary sources to be less important to their research. The study surveyed 278 historians, half of who were full professors and only one-third were women, and compared the responses to a citation analysis conducted in 5 books and 5 journals. Close to 25% of respondents said they discovered primary sources either by talking to an archivist, being in the archive or in the course of archival research (use of finding aids and catalogs were counted separately).
The research topic can also determine, to some extent, how much interaction is needed between the librarian or archivist and the historian. In the case of women’s history, Diane L. Beattie found the archivist plays an essential role in linking a researcher’s subject with relevant materials. The survey of 41 historians from the Canadian Committee on Women’s History showed that consulting the archivist was the most used and most useful method of locating primary information on women. Beattie identified several pitfalls historians face in researching women’s history. The first is simply a lack of materials since records by or about women either do not exist, or were not collected or kept by archives. Second, materials by or about women were not adequately described or indexed in archival holdings, making researchers of women’s history extremely dependent on the archivist’s intimate knowledge of items within their collections. Beattie recommended that archivists create subject guides and better indexing as a way to mitigate the dependency.

In evaluating relationships between historians and archivists, several elements emerge that are relevant to this paper. The studies suggest that working in archives can be a lonely and alienating experience, that forming relationships with archivists is a research strategy, that early to mid-career historians rely more on archives and special collections for their research materials and are likely to be less experienced users, and that subjects like women’s history may require more intervention from archivists or subject specialists.

**Studies of acknowledgements**

Acknowledgements, as part of the paratext of published works, have been studied since the early 1990s in conjunction with broad scholarly interest in cultural analysis.
This section reviews some of the literature produced on the characteristics and patterns of acknowledgements in the humanities.

Blaise Cronin, a professor of information science, has studied the genre of acknowledgements in-depth throughout his career. Several of his studies refer specifically to commonalities in humanities acknowledgements. In a survey of 278 faculty (12% from the humanities), Cronin and Kara Overfelt studied expectations and etiquette in acknowledgement behavior and found considerable agreement in faculty views of acknowledgements. Most of the respondents had been acknowledged in their careers, and although there are no written rules about acknowledgement form or content, most agreed on the kinds of actions or assistance that merited inclusion in acknowledgements. One of the survey questions asked whether acknowledgements were used to quickly assess an article’s provenance and relevance. In stark contrast to social science and science disciplines, 30% of humanists answered that they “always” checked acknowledgments and 60% answered they checked acknowledgements “sometimes.”

In a previous study, Cronin analyzed acknowledgements in articles from psychology, sociology, history and philosophy and identified six categories of thanks expressed in acknowledgements:

1. moral support
2. financial support
3. access to facilities, documents, etc.
4. clerical support
5. technical support
6. peer interactive communication (defined as pre-publication feedback in the form of discussions of research topic and/or comments on drafts)

Historians were less likely than social scientists to include acknowledgements in their articles, but were more likely to use the “access” category – a category likely to include
thanks to archives or special collections. The peer interactive communication category was also widely used across all disciplines indicating that peer feedback is important in all four fields. Furthermore, the authors found that the language and format of acknowledgements in all four disciplines were fairly standardized even though there are no formal rules or recommendations applicable to acknowledgements.

Laurie Scrivener’s study of history students’ dissertation acknowledgements from 1930-2005 found consistent patterns in the format of acknowledgements, with academics (such as dissertation advisors) being thanked first, followed by libraries, librarians and archivists, and ending with thanks to family and friends. Close to 72% of the acknowledgements that referenced support from libraries or archives also mentioned individual librarians and archivists by name. Since references to libraries and archives also exist in footnotes, Scrivener attributed this additional and personal acknowledgement to the student’s nod to the librarian or archivist’s status as the gatekeeper. Another notable finding was an increase over time in the formality of language used in acknowledgements.

Davide Simone Giannoni also found similarities in form and language in his study of acknowledgements in articles from humanities and sciences journals in English and Italian. Giannoni found that acknowledgements contained two “moves”—a framing move that explained the context in which the author’s research was developed, and a credit mapping move where individuals and organizations were thanked for their assistance in the research process. Analysis of these moves showed that humanities acknowledgments were more complex than those from the sciences, with a detailed framing move and with 88% thanking people by name in the credit mapping move. There
were also similarities in the credit mapping move across disciplines and languages, which most often involved an overt expression of gratitude (containing a performative verb and/or an appropriate adjective), use of the word “thanks,” “gratitude,” or “grateful,” and use of the qualifiers “helpful” and “valuable.” Giannoni concluded with a call for further exploration of acknowledgements with attention given to differences in the author’s age, gender, and/or faculty status.

In a study of acknowledgements in books on British literature, Corey Coates, a professor of English, studied how authors construct a professional identity in their acknowledgement of support received from spouses. The study is interesting because it deals with only a subsection of acknowledgements—references to spousal support—and is concerned with the gendered use of language. Coates argues that male authors were more likely to “glorify the unglorifiable” in their references to non-academic support, using florid language to describe mundane activities. Female authors, on the other hand, tended to take a more collegial tone, thanking a community of people and using neutral language that could not be construed as indicating the subordinate or inferior status of the person being acknowledged.

A study of scholar’s references to editorial assistance in acknowledgements is also exemplary because it deals with only one aspect or section of the acknowledgement. Robert Brown analyzed acknowledgements in contemporary monographs published by university presses. Looking for patterns in author’s representations of help received from editors and reviewers, Brown found the acknowledgements in his sample made common use of an analogy of the editor as a “shepherd” of the book. While specific references were made to this pastoral motif, Brown noted that qualities used to describe editors
(such as being caring, patient, efficient) fit with the idea of the editor as a shepherd. Interestingly, the idea was supported in literature by editors describing how they see themselves in relation to authors.

Several of the aspects of acknowledgments described above can inform the present study. The first is the importance of peer interactive communication to humanities scholars and whether Cronin and Overfelt’s concept appears in descriptions of librarians and archivists. The second is Schrivener’s observation of the fact that most history students made references to librarians and archivists my name. The present study of acknowledgments in books may determine whether this is also true for scholars advancing in their careers. It will also attempt to assess authors’ use of language in acknowledgments, paying particular attention to commonalities in verbs and modifiers as in Giannoni’s study. Last, as in Brown’s study, the paper will look for possible uses of metaphor to describe the services of librarians and archivists.

**METHOD**

Content analysis is a method useful for explaining or accounting for values and attitudes that influence the creation of text. It is an inductive approach that seeks to identify themes and categories through a close reading, comparison and rereading of text. As a qualitative method, content analysis allows for the presence of subjective interpretation, analysis guided by theory, and comparison of data with other research to draw conclusions.

In this method, a body of text is defined according to the topic being study. Units of analysis are defined within the text, and are often refined as the data is explored. A coding scheme is developed to identify the different themes and categories that emerge.
The coding is usually tested on a sample text before being applied to the whole data set. Analysis takes place continually as the coding and reading of text is an iterative process. After the data is checked for coding consistency, conclusions can be drawn by making observations about the patterns and themes that have been identified and by incorporating other literature to support the observations.

Content analysis is inherently subjective and conclusions often rely on inferences. It is important, therefore, to establish reliability by demonstrating consistency throughout the analysis—from the coding scheme, to the data presented, to the connections made to other research—and by describing the sample and coding scheme in such a way that the study could be replicated by other researchers using the same materials. Decisions made in the research process, including explanations of how a research question was formed and why a coding scheme was developed should also be included in the research report.38

The method is appropriate for this study of acknowledgements as the goal is to explore historians’ attitudes toward librarians and archivists. Unlike the interview and survey methods used to measure relationships between historians and librarians and archivists in the literature on information needs and behavior, content analysis is unobtrusive way to measure communication.39 The method was used in the studies of acknowledgements described above, where the goal was to identify patterns and commonalities in a specific context, rather than to make generalizations about all acknowledgement behavior. Content analysis can be also useful for providing structures for analysis when previous research or theories on a topic are limited or do not exist, and as such, it is appropriate for studies that seek to describe rather than explain.40
Sample

The sample analyzed in this paper is made up of titles in women’s history published by university presses between 2008 and 2009. University presses were chosen with an anticipation of some level of uniformity in the acknowledgement genre of this particular aspect of scholarly communication. Women’s history was chosen as a subject with the expectation that would represent multiple subfields, regions and periods within the discipline of history. Women’s historians often rely on a variety of non-traditional sources, making the field highly interdisciplinary, but also extremely reliant on collaborations and shared expertise.

By limiting the subject to women’s history, it was also anticipated that the majority of the authors in the sample would be women. Women represent approximately 40% of new PhDs awarded each year and, in the early stages of their career, make up close to 60% of newly hired faculty in history departments. However, the studies discussed in the literature review above often relied on survey and interview responses from historians in their mid- to late careers. Women are underrepresented as associate and full professors in history departments, so while the studies mentioned in the literature review may have accurately represented the target population, they did not fully represent women in the discipline of history. Looking at the work of female authors of history may offer a new perspective, or at least one ripe for comparison, on the disciplinary culture of history.

A search was conducted in WorldCat on January 17, 2010 (see Figure 1) to obtain a sample for analysis. WorldCat is a global catalog of library collections and contains close to 2 million bibliographic records from 12,000 libraries across the world. Individual
libraries, large and small, contribute records to WorldCat on a daily basis making it one of the most comprehensive databases of contemporary published materials.\textsuperscript{43} The WorldCat search specified “university press” in the publisher field and “women” and “history” in the subject fields. “Women’s history” is not a term used in Library of Congress Subject Headings, but the term “women” is used in conjunction with the term “history” in strings like “Women, Khoikhoi—Europe—History—19\textsuperscript{th} Century” or “Women—Suffrage—China—20\textsuperscript{th} Century.” Limiters were placed on the year (2008-2009), language (English) and material (Books). A total of 534 results were returned.

\textbf{Figure 1: WorldCat Search}

![WorldCat Search](image)

Some eliminations were necessary to ensure the results only included secondary sources—scholarship relying on the analysis of primary sources—on the subject of women’s history. Books with subject areas of “history and criticism” were excluded as
these dealt mainly with film, literary and art criticism, and while they covered a historical time period, the authors were engaging with sources themselves rather than analyzing them in a historical context. Reprints, reference books, anthologies and published primary sources were also eliminated along with duplicate records. Last, simply to make the sample size more manageable, books published outside of the United States were eliminated from the sample. This left 153 results. Upon examination, only 114 contained acknowledgments (either in an Acknowledgements section or as part of the Preface).

**Characteristics of the Sample**

The sample is not completely comprehensive as the search only captured books that had been cataloged on WorldCat, possibly excluding a few books that would have otherwise fit the search criteria. Excluding publishers based outside of the United States also eliminated books from “gold standard” publishers, like Oxford and Cambridge University Presses. This may have skewed the sample toward books published by first-time authors. Nevertheless, the sample represents a range of academic presses, subjects relating to women’s history and authors with faculty statuses and academic affiliations not previously included in studies of historians.

The results were almost equally split between books published in 2008 (79) and 2009 (74). The 48 publishers included in the sample come from universities in almost every state in the union with presses associated with larger research institutions as well as smaller specialized schools (see Figure 2). The University of North Carolina Press and University of Illinois Press published the most books in the sample, which is not
surprising as both of these presses specialize in monographs on topics of women and gender.

The subjects included in the sample represent a broad range of subjects in the Library of Congress classification scheme (see Figure 3). The majority are classified in the HQ range – Family, Marriage and Women. American history, world history, and social sciences (a category that often includes gender studies) are also well represented.

**Figure 2: Number of Books by Publisher**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of publisher</th>
<th>Number of books</th>
<th>Name of publisher</th>
<th>Number of books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of North Carolina P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>U of New Mexico P</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yale UP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State UP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Baylor UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kent State UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke UP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northern Illinois UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford UP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ohio State UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia UP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Princeton UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins UP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SUNY UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers UP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U of Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Georgia P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U of Arizona P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Oklahoma P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U of Delaware P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U of Hawaii P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP of Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U of Massachusetts P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U of Missouri P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U of Nebraska P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U of New Hampshire P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U of South Carolina P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U of Virginia P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UP of America</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UP of Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UP of Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of California P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UP of Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Chicago P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vanderbilt UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Nevada P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wesleyan UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As was expected for the genre of women’s history, of the 120 authors in the sample only 12 authors were men, with 2 of that number co-authoring the book with a woman. The academic affiliations of the authors in the sample reflected the subjects of the books in the sample (see Figure 3). Sixty-seven were identified as being employed in the field of history. Six held appointments in women’s studies departments and an additional 9 had joint appointments in women’s/gender studies and history, English or Sociology. Others were identified with interdisciplinary fields such as American studies, Latino studies, religious studies or humanities. The majority of the acknowledgements in the sample came from Assistant Professors, with similarities among those authors identified as working in the field of history and identified with other fields (see Figure 4).
Figure 4: Authors by Academic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic status (all authors in sample, n=120)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Academic status (only historians in sample, n=67)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Scholar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Independent Scholar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government employed historian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archivist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Post doctoral fellow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employed historian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post doctoral fellow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although 74.5% (114 of the 153 books of the sample) acknowledged assistance from librarians and archivists, 25.5% (39 books) did not mention librarians or archivists. Seventeen of the authors in these 39 books were full professors (43.5%) and 25 authors were not working in the field of history (64%). This suggests that among those studying women’s history, trained historians are more likely to publicly recognize input from librarians and archivists and more experienced scholars are less likely acknowledge this input. While it may be true that more experienced scholars are more self-reliant and do not require extensive assistance from librarians or archivists, it could also be that historians in particular are trained early on to recognize librarians and archivists in their work.
Coding Scheme

The Acknowledgements or Preface sections of the 114 books in the sample described above were examined using content analysis. Sentences with references to librarians and archivists were considered units of analysis.\textsuperscript{46}

Out of the 114 books, 58 had acknowledgments digitally available on Google preview. To formulate a coding scheme, 29 of the digital acknowledgements (see Appendix) were read with an eye toward patterns and similarities. Common descriptions of services performed by librarians, archivists, museum curators and historical society staff (e.g., “located sources”) common adjectives (e.g., “cheerfully”), and reoccurring themes (e.g., “worked miracles”) were identified in the initial reading. All 114 acknowledgments were then read noting the services, descriptive words, and any thematic phrases relating to librarians and archivists (see Figure 5). Occurrences of references to librarians and archivists by name were also recorded. Later, the thematic phrases were read again and placed into one of three categories of relationships—personal, peer and patron.

Figure 5: Coding Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Thematic phrase</th>
<th>Staff mentioned by name?</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td>Ready</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example A: “Archivists at the Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore College and the Quaker Collection at Haverford College provided ready and efficient assistance.”\textsuperscript{47}

Example B: “The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) Archives are a treasure trove for any historian interested in learning about the Civil War on the northern home front. I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to Jonathan Stayer, Linda Ries, and Richard Saylor, who helped me find many of the commission’s hidden treasures. All three were—and continue to be—patient with my frequent questions and are always cheerfully ready to help me to cross-check my facts in person and via the Internet.”\textsuperscript{48}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Thematic phrase</th>
<th>Staff mentioned by name?</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Locate Reference</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Hidden treasure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS

Librarians and archivists were mentioned by name in 32 (28%) of the 114 books. It was more common for a special mention of one or two librarians and/or archivist’s names to come before or after a more general statement of thanks to library or archive staff, occurring in 56 (49%) titles. The remaining 26 (22%) referred to librarians, archivists or staff as a general group without mentioning individual names.

Expressions of gratitude for “help” or general “assistance” were most common, occurring 55 times. Many authors were also quite specific in mentioning the services that were most appreciated (see Figure 6). Librarians and archivists were thanked for locating sources, providing access to materials, providing reference services, sharing personal knowledge about sources and collection, assisting with permissions, and, most interestingly, handling materials.

Locating and getting permission to use images seemed of particular importance to women’s historians, as did access to “special” sources. Several authors specifically stated their appreciation for the use of sources that were in storage, unprocessed or not yet cataloged. As in Delgadillo and Lynch’s study, Interlibrary Loan services were also mentioned specifically for sources that were obscure or difficult to obtain.
Figure 6: Instances of Acknowledgement of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images or photographs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscure, uncatalogued or unprocessed material</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Special materials</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital objects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to sources</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Knowledge or expertise of sources</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Information about collection</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained on computer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANDLING MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>PERMISSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieve</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of images</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use of quotes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Take photos of materials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Librarians and archivists were most often thanked for their generosity, helpfulness, invaluable service or expertise, and support. This use of language directly corresponds with Giannoni’s findings, suggesting that it may be somewhat standardized. Some descriptions were straightforward, such as references to efficiency. Citations of “untiring” and “sublime” abilities seem to border on exaggeration, while a few descriptions, such as references to a librarian or archivist’s “stellar” profession, hardworking attitude and “remarkable enthusiasm” for their jobs, could be construed as patronizing (see Figure 7). Exaggerated descriptions were infrequent, which could potentially support Coates’s supposition that women are less prone to flowery language than men. Further research is needed before any concrete conclusions can be drawn in this area.
Figure 7: Common Descriptors of Librarians and Archivists by Number of Occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>generous</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>diligent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>enjoyable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>competent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invaluable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>extraordinary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>welcoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>remarkable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>collegial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>gracious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indispensable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>essential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouraging</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>tenacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sublime</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>incredible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>courteous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>stellar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>able</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>hardworking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>good humored</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, several themes were identified through an analysis of specific phrases that appeared in conjunction with descriptions of services rendered by librarians and archivists (see Figure 8). The themes signal three levels of interaction between historians and librarians and archivists: personal, peer, and patron. Historians made an effort to acknowledge instances where personal friendship or hospitality was extended to them. Specific references were also made to professional and intellectual contributions to the historians’ research. Finally, historians seemed to use analogies when a librarian or archivist’s activity made them more aware of their status as a patron. Actions that appeared to be inexplicable to historians were described in phenomenal terms, where the librarian or archivist performed heroic deeds such as “walking on water” or going to “battle” to obtain sources. These themes will be explored in more detail in the following section.
Figure 8: Thematic Descriptions of Librarians and Archivists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Interactions: Hospitality and Friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hosts (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided conversation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided friendship (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offered room and board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invited into home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Made the city feel like home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Chatted with a lonely stranger”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “A researcher’s best friend”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drove around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Took to places being researched, arranged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared local knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Interactions: Advised research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• made suggestions (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shared own research experiences (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• at the heart of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “shaped my approach”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• showed how to reconstruct a story with sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• expressed insight into research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• guided research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• engaged in researcher’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• enhanced research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sent follow-up emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• helped at every stage of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• read, commented on drafts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patron Interactions: Heroic deeds and miracles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Uncovered hidden treasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opened doors to treasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walked on water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willing to go to battle to obtain sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paragons of the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Angels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Houdini-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worked magic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worked miracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could find anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not enough songs about their works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “All too often unsung”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

Acknowledgments of library and archive services and the use of language in descriptions of those who rendered the services are closely related to the three themes identified above. This section discusses some of examples of interactions on the personal, profession and phenomenal level in the context of the findings of literature on acknowledgements and the information needs and behavior of historians.

Personal Interactions

Authors of women’s history made an obvious effort to thank librarians and archivists for the hospitality and friendship they received over the course of their research. As Johnson and Duff noted, “chatting” seemed to be an important aspect of the personal relationships developed between historians and librarians and archivists. References to librarian and archivists’ hospitality, including a willingness to drive
researchers around a new city or invite them into their homes on occasion, indicate that librarians and archivists have a unique ability to make the uncomfortable task of researching far from one’s own home more “welcoming,” “enjoyable” and “positive.”

At the same time, special acknowledgment of these activities suggests that normal interactions in libraries or archives are not extremely enjoyable or positive. One historian, describing the trees outside the window of the archive, noted that “trees are excellent company, and so are the archive’s kind and knowledgeable staff.” In this case, it seemed that the historian would have been content working in an environment with a soothing view; that the archive’s staff was kind to her was an added and unexpected bonus.

Citing librarians and archivists as a “researcher’s best friend” could also indicate that friendship was not entirely sincere and, as Johnson and Duff suggest, was used as a strategy to gain what was viewed as special treatment from the archivist. However, this correlation is not entirely clear as mentions of friendship were infrequent.

**Peer Interaction**

More often, historians thanked librarians and archivists for what Cronin and Overfelt described as peer interactive communication. Librarians and archivists were described as playing a peer-like role in evaluating and making suggestions to enhance and shape the scholar’s research. The expertise and knowledge of librarians and archivists was specifically cited, and seemed to apply to their knowledge of sources and collections as well as their ability to show how sources could be used. This corresponds to the findings of Duff and Johnson and Orbach.
Librarians and archivists were also acknowledged as contributing to every stage of the research process, not just in finding sources. One historian expressed gratefulness for help with how to approach a topic and carry out a research plan, another was thankful for comments made on a draft, and several others said they benefited from reading the librarian or archivist’s own research. Librarians and archivists were thanked for being “supportive” and “encouraging” of the scholar’s work. These expressions of thanks were similar to those historians gave to colleagues and students in their departments and subfields, and may indicate that, at least in some cases, librarians and archivists were considered colleagues. This supposition merits further research, perhaps through a more systematic comparison of acknowledgements of librarians and archivists with acknowledgments of help received at conferences, forums or seminars.

**Patron Interactions**

If these acknowledgements point to the personal and professional relationships of historians with librarians and archivists, they also suggest that historians remain disconnected from the library and archival work. About 10% of the historians in this sample described librarian and archivist’s ability of to locate unique or obscure sources as works of miracles, imbuing them with powers of angels and magicians. Descriptions of basic services as “extraordinary” or “incredible” may be considered examples of historians’ lack of understanding of archival organization, methods and day-to-day functions. This supports Cook’s position that for historians, the archive is a foreign country.⁵¹
Statements about librarians and archivists “going to battle” to obtain sources and “opening doors to treasure” reinforces Johnson and Duff’s assessment that early to mid-career historians believe archivists to be gatekeepers and the only ones capable of accessing particular sources. More research is needed to evaluate the accuracy of this assessment, but nevertheless, it reinforces the need for librarians and archivists to be ever more conscious of making historians aware of archival principles to help them become expert users.  

CONCLUSION

This study looked at the acknowledgments of women’s history books to see how historians view their relationship with librarians and archivists. The study found that historians represent their relationships with librarians and archivists as personal, peers, or patrons. The findings support literature on historians’ information needs and behavior, which have suggested that historians, especially in the early stages of their careers, believe librarians and archivists have unique abilities that can benefit the historian’s research process. On one hand they have the ability to make the research environment more user friendly by being collegial and welcoming. On the other hand, they are seen as able to make insightful contributions to a researcher’s work.

Like the authors in Brown’s study, the historians in this study used analogies to describe library and archive service. A common motif was the librarian or archivist as a magician who could conjure up obscure sources. Further research on how librarians and archivists view themselves and their own relationship with historians could be useful for evaluating how accurate this image is.
The study demonstrates the usefulness of studying acknowledgments to corroborate evidence produced from other research and to create a fuller picture of a disciplinary culture. The proliferation of digital collections and the increasing availability of email reference have the potential to change relationships between researchers and librarians and archivists by providing increased access to materials and a decreasing need for face-to-face interaction. It would be interesting to see if acknowledgements change as sources and services change.53 Further research into the types of questions historians ask and how they are answered could also shed more light on historians’ unique and complex relationship with librarians and archivists.
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Museum curators were also referenced several times in the sample. As these occurred alongside thanks to librarians and archivists (usually in the same sentence), they were also counted.


For an example of how email reference in archives could be studied, see Duff and Johnson, “A Virtual Expression of Need.”
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# APPENDIX

## Sample for Coding*

*Names and institutional affiliation have been truncated in brackets in various places for the purposes of easing transcription not to obscure the identity of individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT EXCERPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Rosen, <em>Terror in the Heart of Freedom</em>, U of North Carolina Press, 2009.</td>
<td>I thank the fellows and staff at the Newberry Library, including [14 people] for their lively engagement in my work…My research was facilitated by the knowledgeable staffs at many archives. I would like to thank especially the skilled archivists [4 people at 4 archives] for their efforts on my behalf. For help locating photographs, I thank [2 people].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. E. Gunter, <em>Alice in Jamesland</em>, U of Nebraska Press, 2009.</td>
<td>I am indebted to…Dr Harold Worthley of the Congregational Library…staff at the National Archives; staff at the Harvard Archive; staff at the American Jewish Archives…I also thank [individuals and staff at 8 libraries].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A. Giesberg, <em>The Army at Home</em>, U of North Carolina Press, 2009</td>
<td>I owe a debt of gratitude to [librarian] at Interlibrary Loan Department for leaving no stone unturned…Thank you to Jennifer Pohlhaus of Villanova's UNIT and Michael Foight of Falvey Library for help with the images. The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) Archives are a treasure trove for any historian interested in learning about the Civil War on the northern home front. I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to [3 archivists], who helped me to find many of the commission's hidden treasures. All three were--and continue to be--patient with my frequent questions and are always cheerfully ready to help me to cross-check my facts, in person and via the Internet. It was Linda who came to me one day and said, &quot;Someday, someone needs to do something with these letters to Governor Curtin asking for money to retrieve bodies.&quot; That collection opened up a whole new world for me as I tried to understand what it was like for women dealing with the loss of a solider-relation. [2 archivists] deserve thanks for helping me think clearly about the questions I was asking early on. With cuts in state spending, everyone at the PHMC is doing the work of at least two people, yet they are always willing to help someone to whom they really owe nothing and who generally asks too many questions. Beyond Pennsylvania, I received welcome assistance from the following archivists [11 people at 9 libraries and archives].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lavrin</td>
<td><em>Brides of Christ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. M. Harris</td>
<td><em>Dr. Mary Walker</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. B. Jones</td>
<td><em>Fathers of Conscience</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. M. Kluchin</td>
<td><em>Fit to be Tied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. S. Murray</td>
<td><em>For Glory and Bolivar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. M. Charron</td>
<td><em>Freedom's Teacher</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Book Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. J. Smith</td>
<td><em>Gender and the Mexican Revolution</em>, U of North Carolina Press, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fatherly</td>
<td><em>Gentlewomen and Learned Ladies</em>, Lehigh UP, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Paisley</td>
<td><em>Glamour in the Pacific</em>, U of Hawaii Press, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. G. Batson</td>
<td><em>Her Oxford</em>, Vanderbilt UP, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. C. Wolfeman</td>
<td><em>Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley</em>, U of Missouri Press, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lynch-Brennan</td>
<td><em>Irish Bridget</em>, Syracuse UP, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A. Weiner</td>
<td><em>Jewish Junior League, Texas A&amp;M UP, 2008</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Rose</td>
<td><em>Jewish Women, U of Texas Press, 2008</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Cochran</td>
<td><em>Louise Pound, U of Nevada Press, 2009</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. P. Hay</td>
<td><em>Madeline McDowell Breckinridge, UP of Kentucky, 2009</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Jensen</td>
<td><em>Mobilizing Minerva, U of Illinois Press, 2008</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Marks</td>
<td><em>Moses and the Monster, U of Illinois Press, 2009</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Book Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Orozco</td>
<td>No Mexican, Women or Dogs, U of Texas Press, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. F. Edwards</td>
<td>People and their Peace, U of North Carolina Press, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Pastorello</td>
<td>Power Among Them, U of Illinois Press, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. J. Popiel</td>
<td>Rousseau's Daughters, U of New Hampshire Press, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Herzig</td>
<td>Savonarola's Women, U of Chicago, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Jack</td>
<td>Science on the Homefront, U of Illinois Press, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. K. Little</td>
<td>You Must Be From the North, UP of Mississippi, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>