Addressing Patron-Perpetrated Sexual Harassment in Libraries: Four Propositions for Intersectional Feminist Anti-violence Education in LIS

Tami Oliphant
University of Alberta
toliphan@ualberta.ca

Danielle Allard
University of Alberta
allard@ualberta.ca

Angela Lieu
University of Alberta
angela.lieu@ualberta.ca

Abstract

It is becoming increasingly clear that sexual harassment is a serious problem within libraries. In particular, patron-perpetrated sexual harassment is the sexual harassment of library staff by the very patrons they endeavor to support. In this paper we identify and offer four propositions for Library and Information Studies (LIS) education that renders patron-perpetrated sexual harassment visible and an important topic to take up within LIS classrooms. Proposition 1: LIS education must address and theorize the structural underpinnings (e.g., patriarchy, white supremacy, and rape culture) that uphold and perpetuate sexual harassment in libraries. Proposition 2: LIS education must create space to understand and discuss sexual harassment by drawing on student experiences to inform interventions. Proposition 3: LIS education about sexual harassment must include both LIS educators and practitioners. Library workers are an essential partner. Proposition 4: Anti-violence education must be embedded throughout the LIS curriculum. Underpinning these propositions is the need for a comprehensive and nuanced examination of gender, race, and their intersections in LIS in order to recognize, name, and resist acts of gender-based violence such as patron-perpetrated sexual harassment. We call for an LIS education rooted in intersectional feminist anti-violence pedagogy that supports the use of critical and anti-violence theory to understand patron-perpetrated sexual harassment in libraries, connects theory to practice, and is supported by the voices, perspectives, and experiential knowledge of students and those working in libraries.

Introduction

Pervasive and damaging, the far-reaching impact of sexual harassment in the workplace has been brought to public awareness by courageous truth-tellers and the social movements #MeToo and #TimesUp. It is becoming increasingly clear to those working in libraries, as well as the Library and Information Studies (LIS) field more generally, that sexual harassment is also a serious problem within libraries (DeWitt, 2017; Jensen, 2017). In particular, patron-perpetrated sexual harassment (PPSH) is the sexual harassment of library staff by the very patrons they endeavor to

Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education, 2020, 15(1), pp. 95-109.

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

support. We have argued elsewhere that PPSH in libraries is an "everyday" form of gender-based violence that has been minimized by and downplayed within the library profession itself as well as within LIS education (Allard, Lieu, & Oliphant, in press). While Master of Library and Information Studies (MLIS) programs may take up many issues related to the topic such as library service provision, and the importance and complexity of patron information needs, rights, and subjectivities, in our experience as both students and instructors in multiple MLIS programs, we have not encountered classroom instruction that addresses the presence and consequences of gender-based violence and sexual harassment and their relationship to library service provision. This paper seeks to intervene in this gap by problematizing sexual harassment in libraries through intersectional feminist anti-violence, and critical race lenses and offering four propositions about how we might begin to develop responses to address this issue within an LIS curriculum and classroom.

The Canada Labour code defines sexual harassment as "any conduct, comment, gesture, or contact of a sexual nature that is likely to cause offence, humiliation to any employee, or that might be perceived by that employee as placing a condition of sexual nature on employment or on any opportunity for training or promotion" (Government of Canada, 2016). In the context of libraries specifically, sexual harassment is often perpetrated by library patrons as part of their interactions with staff members, who are often young women. Sexual harassment can occur as part of formal interactions, such as when a patron is requesting information or assistance, but they are also often experienced as offhand comments or actions directed at staff as they move through the public portions of the library. The following quotations are just three examples of PPSH that were collected at library conference sessions on this topic delivered to library workers (Allard, Oliphant, & Lieu, 2019; Oliphant, Allard, & Lieu, 2019).

- "Being told that you are 'looking hot.'"
- "Shelving books on the floor [and being told]--'wow, I can see you look good on your knees.'"
- "Being followed to your car after work by a patron who tried to get your phone number during the day."

These examples represent a wide range of experiences—including the use of what some might call "uncomfortable" language to potentially dangerous and certainly terrifying patron behaviours. A number of recently published blog posts and articles written by library workers further identify and describe the particularities of PPSH in libraries (DeWitt, 2019; Jensen, 2017; MacBride, 2018). Although these interactions may be viewed as "not that bad" by some, recent news stories illustrate extreme, and tragic, ways that gender-based violence can manifest in libraries. In 2018, Amber Clark, a library worker in Sacramento, California was shot and killed outside the library by a male patron who had previously been banned (Sullivan, 2018). Earlier that same year, Elisabeth Salm, a volunteer librarian, was sexually assaulted and killed while working in a library in Ottawa, Ontario (Yogaretnam, 2018). We argue that these egregious acts of violence are not isolated occurrences, but symptoms of a society and a profession that – by refusing to name, examine, and combat more "subtle" instances of sexual harassment – perpetuate violence against women.

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

Although the issue of PPSH is not one that we believe is typically present in the LIS curriculum as a topic of study, students bring and share their experiences of workplace harassment with them into the classroom nonetheless. Two of the authors of this paper are instructors in the MLIS program at the School of Library and Information Studies, University of Alberta, while another is a public librarian and recent graduate of the program. We have come to realize that the problem of PPSH in public libraries is well known by LIS students, often young women working part-time in libraries while they are students. In our classrooms, students have shared examples of patron interactions that have caused them discomfort, worry, fear, or embarrassment. Sometimes students shrugged or laughed off these experiences and sometimes they were very upset about them. Often students, or their employers, did not label these experiences explicitly as sexual harassment but view them as annoying or upsetting inconveniences that come with the job (Yagil, 2008); nonetheless the personal consequences of these encounters were often described as significant. The pervasiveness and seriousness of PPSH that has been raised by LIS students has been reinforced for us through ongoing conversations with library workers in Alberta and Ontario, Canada (Allard, Oliphant, & Lieu, 2019; Oliphant, Allard, & Lieu, 2019).We have come to realize that within the LIS classroom there is a significant need to address the risks of sexual harassment of future librarians and create space for related careful discussion.

Drawing from the authors' collective experiences and knowledges, including our classroom experiences, workplace knowledge, and the discussions at conference sessions and workshops where library workers have shared their experiences with us, we ask: what could sexual harassment education in LIS look like? We start from the assumption that it is deeply troubling that this topic is largely unacknowledged within LIS research, librarianship, and education. Indeed, this lack of acknowledgement stands in sharp contrast to the growing accounts of sexual harassment by library workers that inform our understanding of this issue. We draw from intersectional anti-violence feminist pedagogy to offer four propositions for LIS education to begin thinking about the complexities of PPSH in libraries.

Intersectional Feminist Anti-Violence Education

Because we frame sexual harassment as an issue of gender-based violence, we look to intersectional feminist anti-violence theory and praxis as frameworks to shape our responses to and instruction within this area. Anti-violence research and activism has long been at the heart of feminist theory and politics. An integral part of feminist conceptualizations of patriarchy is an acknowledgement that the subjugation of women is enacted and upheld through a myriad of systems of violence (Bromley, 2012; Lorde, 1984). Feminist anti-violence movements have long acknowledged the interconnectedness between "structures, systems, and practices of intimate, interpersonal, and institutional violence" (Russo, 2018, p. 87). Many feminist movements thus understand violences against women as enacted along a continuum of violence, occurring in both public and private spaces, and including for example, street violence, domestic violence, racial violence, violence in war, sexual harassment, workplace violence, and sexual assault. Women of colour movements such as The Combahee River Collective (1977) have very persuasively argued that violence and oppression are contoured and amplified by additional systems of oppression that make women especially vulnerable to violence. An "integrated analysis and

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression [such as race, class, gender, and sexual orientation] are interlocking" (Combahee River Collective, 1977, p. 1), intersectionality is a tool intended to create political and social change (Crenshaw, 1989; Lorde, 1984).

Intersectionality can serve LIS as a theoretical framework and, perhaps more importantly, a way for people to understand and articulate collective lived experiences and solidarity—connecting experience to theory. For women of colour in particular, "violence weaves through the daily tissues of [their] living" including in the LIS classroom and in the workplace (Lorde, 1984, p. 119). LIS educators might thus draw from intersectional and anti-violence feminist frameworks to empower students by giving voice to their experiences, and to use these experiences to envision praxis and social change. Explicit work within LIS education to name patriarchy and whiteness, and expose where power and privilege resides, can assist students to recognize and (re)consider the invisibilized politics of race and gender in LIS and the interlocking systems of oppression that make gender-based violence such as sexual harassment possible within our institutions.

We recently conducted an environmental scan examining client perpetrated workplace sexual harassment in feminized fields including management and retail, nursing and healthcare, and women's and gender studies (Allard, Lieu, & Oliphant, in press). Though all fields identified the importance of delivering workplace sexual harassment education, our findings reveal a significant absence of education and training about this topic in all fields. There are a growing number of on the job sexual harassment training that have been developed in the retail sector such as Ontario's hospitality and tourism "It's Your Shift" online modules (Ontario Tourism Education Corporation, 2017), but very little literature identifying how to address workplace sexual harassment in pre-professional education and training such as LIS classrooms. We did identify discussions of sexual harassment in post-secondary education in sports management (Taylor, Jones, McCray, & Hardin, 2019; Taylor & Paule-Koba, 2020), nursing (Lux, Hutcheson, & Peden, 2014), and social work (Wood & Moylan, 2017). We also draw from discussions about education for street based sexual harassment (Bond, 2017) as well as gender-based violence in post-secondary and adult education classrooms (Godderis & Root, 2017; Lange & Young, 2019). Educational approaches to workplace AND non-workplace sexual harassment inform the approach advocated in this paper. Discussions of professional workplace sexual harassment point to the need for students to gain relevant knowledge of health and safety policy, management and human resources, legal rights, and personal strategies related to addressing sexual harassment in the workplace (Taylor & Paule-Koba, 2020; Wood & Moylan, 2017). Educational approaches that discuss street based sexual harassment and other forms of gender based violence are equally important to consider because a fundamental aspect of these educational approaches is designed to convince students that sexual harassment is real, that it matters, and that it can have significant consequences for individuals, communities, and institutions (Bond, 2017; Lange & Young, 2019). Thus these approaches often focus on feminist consciousness raising and are more likely to explore the social conditions that contribute to gender based violence. Unlike similar feminized professional fields such as nursing, LIS has not widely acknowledged the presence or prevalence of PPSH within our profession. We draw on

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

this work to understand the contexts in which sexual harassment is experienced and discussed AS WELL AS to persuade the field of LIS and the profession more generally, that sexual harassment is an issue that matters and can be usefully used to describe and counter, what some call "difficult experiences" between patrons and library workers. Applying intersectional feminist anti-violence frameworks does the necessary work of validating sexual harassment as a library problem and offering systemic interventions.

We thus draw from well-established principles of intersectional feminist and anti-violence theory and activism to identify four propositions to advance sexual harassment education in LIS. Where appropriate, we also point to anti-violence policies and practices such as workplace policies and sexual harassment education from other fields. The four propositions are:

1. LIS education must understand and teach the structural underpinnings that allow gender-based violence, such as sexual harassment, that is rooted in patriarchy, rape culture, and white supremacy to occur in libraries.
2. LIS education must create space in our classrooms for understanding and talking about experiences of sexual harassment to inform learning and interventions on this topic.
3. LIS educators must build bridges to library practice and be informed by practitioners and practice. Our understanding and teaching of this issue should include theory, workplace content, and experience.
4. Anti-violence education must be embedded within LIS programs at all levels. This isn't a one class or one topic issue. The problem is embedded and so must the solutions be.

Through these four propositions, our intention is to identify, interrogate, and ultimately dismantle the social structures that uphold PPSH. More concretely, we also aim to build the capacity of students to address this complex problem in the current moment and as they take on roles of increasing responsibility in their workplace. The remainder of this paper examines each of the four propositions carefully in hopes of sparking deep conversation in a largely ignored area.

1. LIS education must understand and teach the structural underpinnings that allow gender-based violence, such as sexual harassment, that is rooted in patriarchy, rape culture, and white supremacy to occur in libraries.

In this section we identify and apply intersectional feminist, critical race, and whiteness theory that unearths the structural underpinnings that support PPSH. We do so both to make this issue visible as well as to offer theoretical frameworks and readings that might be taken up by LIS educators to address this topic with their students. Indeed, a comprehensive and nuanced examination of gender, race, and their intersections in LIS, particularly in the LIS classroom, is necessary to recognize, name, and disrupt the complex structural factors that enable and sustain white supremacy and patriarchy, and more specifically, acts of gender-based violence such as PPSH at the library. To inspire and invoke broad structural changes, theory about, language for, and examinations through feminist anti-violence perspectives and feminist education must be taught in our classrooms.

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

As with all forms of gender-based violence, feminist scholarship identifies patriarchy and rape culture—a culture where gender-based and sexual violence against women is pervasive and normalized (Buchwald, Fletcher, & Roth, 1993)—as underpinning sexual harassment (Baker, 2008; MacKinnon, 1979). Although PPSH has been and continues to be addressed by workplaces as an issue of individual deviance or incompetence (e.g. a bad customer or an unassertive employee), our research suggests this phenomenon be understood as rooted in deeply ingrained social structures of patriarchy, rape culture, and white supremacy (Allard, Lieu, & Oliphant, in press). Indeed, library workers are situated precisely at the intersection of feminized work, service work, care work, and precarious work – all of which exist within systems of patriarchy and white supremacy and result in the de-professionalization, devaluation, and sexualization of women's labour (Allard, Lieu, & Oliphant, in press). Politics of feminized labour are both gendered and racialized – placing women workers within service work (e.g. retail, hospitality, food service) and care work (e.g. nursing, long-term care) in positions of relatively little power (Adib & Guerrier, 2003). This is often further compounded by intersectional aspects of library workers' identity, such as race, that disadvantage women of colour within a homogenous workplace and make them additionally vulnerable to sexual harassment. For example, a study by Chou and Pho (2017) demonstrates that for women of colour, PPSH at libraries often manifests as racialized comments and microaggressions.

In her 1992 book, Roma Harris described the feminization of libraries and clearly articulated its consequences in devaluing the profession (Harris, 1992). Since then a growing body of work has examined the feminization of library work (Higgins, 2017; Schlesselman-Tarango, 2017); few however, have interrogated the ways that politics of gender intersect with race within the field and its workplaces. Some scholars and practitioners have interrogated, articulated, and problematized the pervasiveness of whiteness within LIS (e.g. Hathcock, 2015; Honma, 2005; Schlesselman-Tarango, 2016); this has implications for the ways that we do or do not think about PPSH. Despite librarianship's commitments to social responsibility as well as diversity and inclusion, scholars and practitioners within LIS have articulated the ways that white feminism has traditionally been, and continues to be, the dominant manifestation of feminism within LIS (Hildenbrand, 2000; Watson, 2017). The centering of middle/upper-class white women, and subsequent erasure of women of colour, through white feminism "limits [LIS'] capacity for substantive change by reinforcing white supremacy and cultural hegemony within [its] organizations" (Watson, 2017, p. 145). As Audre Lorde (1984) notes, the lack of intersectional considerations by "ignoring the differences of race between women and the implications of those differences presents the most serious threat to the mobilization of women's joint power" (p. 117). Watson (2017) argues that white feminist discourse, along with contemporary notions of neoliberal feminism, are fundamental to mainstream LIS praxis – sanitizing the field's conversations about diversity and equity by focusing on demographics rather than power structures, and reinforcing false ideals of colour blindness, meritocracy, and individual exceptionalism.

To articulate ways that whiteness converges with femininity in dominant perceptions of library work held by the field of librarianship and library patrons, Schlesselman-Tarango (2016) invokes

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

the archetype of Lady Bountiful in order to examine the ways that library work is shaped by and continues to shape patriarchy, white supremacy, and colonialism through the performance and embodiment of "ideal" femininity. The embodiment and expectations of Lady Bountiful – people-pleasing, benevolent, subservient, hospitable, meek, etc. – situate library workers to receive (and be limited in their ability to resist) sexual harassment from patrons. In particular, whiteness, and its accompanying aspirations of neutrality, within libraries invoke in its workers the "(aspirational) state of being for all and against none" (Schlesselman-Tarango, 2016, p. 2), an ideology that perpetrators of sexual harassment certainly take advantage of in libraries. Indeed, there are numerous popular stereotypes of the "sexy librarian" that sexualize and objectify library workers – enhancing their vulnerability to sexual harassment and further devaluing and deprofessionalizing their work (Keer & Carlos, 2014; Pagowsky & Rigby, 2014). The "sexy librarian" – besides being portrayed as compliant and subservient – is also almost always depicted as a white woman. We contend that this reinforces and reproduces dominant and problematic structures such as patriarchy, white supremacy, and rape culture within library spaces. Scholars have interrogated the aesthetics of cuteness and nostalgia within library work, which works to mask and neutralize white supremacy while enabling sexual harassment (Schlesselman-Tarango, 2017; Natarajan, 2017). Nostalgia in libraries – the devotion to historical narratives of benevolence, neutrality, and innocence through the embodiment of cuteness – veils the workings of privilege, and power that are foundational to LIS, invoking feelings of vocational awe – "the set of ideas, values, and assumptions librarians have about themselves and the profession that result in notions that libraries as institutions are inherently good, sacred notions, and therefore beyond critique"– that foreclose space to examine the field's hegemonic foundations (Ettarh, 2018). Beyond this, vocational awe also compels library workers to minimize and tolerate experiences of PPSH by prioritizing the comfort of library patrons over their own. Library patrons' reading of library work(ers) are also influenced by cuteness and nostalgia both of which provide (male) patrons with a sense of entitlement over library workers that are rooted in whiteness and patriarchy.

Too often, sexual harassment is framed as an issue of boundaries and unwanted attention while racism, sexism, transphobia, etc. are described as unpopular, unconventional, or controversial opinions. To address this LIS scholars and educators must be critical and intentional with reading lists and word choices as they demonstrate to students how gendered and raced frameworks are normalized in LIS. For example, instructors might unpack seminal library documents and guidelines through these lenses. We offer one example here of teaching the ALA Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) guidelines. Many LIS programs introduce students to the notion of serving library patrons, particularly as service relates to the provision of individual reference and information services. Teaching reference services includes an emphasis on both the social and interpersonal aspects of interacting with patrons as well as technical proficiencies related to finding, evaluating, and providing information to patrons. Social and interpersonal aspects of reference are introduced through learning about and practicing the reference interview. Students are often introduced to the notion of the reference interview through class readings, lectures, and in class practice; they are encouraged to try to understand patrons' needs, articulate the social conditions that inform patrons' questions, and to respond to patron requests by using library service provision best practices as outlined by the RUSA Guidelines for Behavioral

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

Performance of Reference and Information Service Providers (2019). As persuasively argued by Emmelhainz, Pappas, and Seale (2017) this approach, and the RUSA guidelines meant to articulate what "good" reference service should look like, prioritizes the performance of emotional labour by library workers. In other words, library workers are compelled to take a "customer is always right" approach to providing reference services–prioritizing the emotional needs and feelings of patrons, and downplaying and minimizing their own needs. The RUSA guidelines describe this in terms of smiling and appearing attentive and welcoming to patrons at all times. An intersectional feminist anti-violence approach would interrogate many of these assumptions, asking students to read and critically unpack feminist and critical race counter arguments, such as that proposed by Emmelhainz, Pappas, and Seale (2017), that identify and make visible the feminized and racialized nature of library service provision and its consequences as articulated in library documents such as the RUSA guidelines. This discussion offers approaches to think through existing service frameworks that acknowledge how librarianship is raced and classed and the particular vulnerabilities this creates for gender-based violence.

2. LIS education must create space in our classrooms for understanding and talking about experiences of sexual harassment to inform learning and interventions on this topic.

In addition to unpacking and making visible the structural conditions that create conditions ripe for the sexual harassment of library workers, we must also make room in our classrooms for meaningful student conversations around this issue. Indeed the notion of feminist praxis suggests that critical knowledge is generated from women's lived experiences and epistemological perspectives and is based upon believing the many and varied intersectional experiences of women in order to frame theory and action (Bromley, 2012; Accardi, 2013). In proposition one, we argue that explicit work within LIS education to name patriarchy and white hegemony, and expose where power and privilege resides can empower students to recognize and (re)consider the invisibilized politics of race and gender in LIS. More personally, these theories can also provide the framework to help identify, label, and name sexual harassment for what it is. As Sara Ahmed (2017) notes, "Words can then allow us to make sense out of experiences; words can allow us to comprehend what we experience after the event.... Having names for problems can make a difference. Before you could not quite put your finger on it. With these words as tools, we revisit our own histories; we hammer away at the past" (pp. 32-33). Indeed, when the issue of patron service provision was discussed, some of our students did not identify incidents that we might identify as sexual harassment, but rather explained or minimized their experiences as a patron being "rude" or that "they [the patron] didn't know better because they are from a different generation." An intersectional feminist ant-violence perspective argues that labelling an incident as sexist, racist, an example of emotional labour, or a microaggression serves to externalize the harassment rather than second-guessing oneself (e.g. Did I say something to provoke this person?) or otherwise internalize the incident. In other words, labelling and contextualizing sexual harassment can help the harassed recognize that the harassment was not, and is never, their fault. More than this, we are also arguing that it is through understanding library workers' experiences that solutions to these issues may be generated.

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

Many educators have discussed ways that radical librarianship and social justice might be enacted as both a framework and topic within LIS classrooms (e.g. Gilliland, 2011; Cooke, Sweeney, & Noble, 2016; Pawley, 2006; Roberts & Noble, 2016). It is important for us to also recognize that politics of race and gender are always *already at play* in LIS classrooms; library schools and educators are not immune from the workings of race and power in a white- and women-dominated field. As it stands, the field's dedication to the practical can leave little physical or intellectual space for stories of violence, particularly as they relate to sexual harassment, to be heard and examined in classrooms and workspaces. More than this, unlike in other professional fields where sexual harassment is publically recognized as a significant concern (such as nursing), it can be difficult to teach a topic that has not been widely taken up or legitimated by the academic field or the profession. Consciousness-raising about the issue must therefore be part of this work.

A recent Canadian study revealed that 58% of first-year women post secondary students reported having experienced some incidence of sexualized violence since the age of 14 (Senn et al., 2014). Bringing sexual harassment discussions into the classroom can be difficult because this topic may be triggering or stressful for those who have experienced sexual harassment at the library and well beyond. Indeed, given these numbers, Root and Godderis (2016) suggest that we should always assume that there are survivors of gender-based violence in our classrooms. We also know that the classroom is not and perhaps should not be a safe space to talk about personal issues, particularly experiences of violence. It is also very important to acknowledge that instructors may feel ill equipped to open up conversations about sexual harassment within the classroom for fear that they will not know how to address difficult conversations or disclosures should they occur (Root & Godderis, 2016). This is an extremely valid concern and one that we struggle with ourselves as we always wrestle with how to both frame as well as respond to difficult personal classroom experiences and disclosures of violence in our teaching. We wish therefore to acknowledge that discussing incidents of sexual harassment in the classroom is fraught yet can generate important insights and knowledge. Creating classroom space for these conversations to occur must be undertaken carefully, with considerable forethought, and with an awareness of the risks and challenges of teaching gender-based violence in post-secondary classrooms (Godderis & Root, 2017; Lange & Young, 2019; Root & Godderis, 2016). Following from Cooke et al. (2016) and Ahmed (2017), these difficult conversations must be entered into willingly by all parties and they must be carefully planned for and disclosed well in advance. As a field we badly need to generate more conversation among instructors about how to do this difficult work.

3. LIS educators must build bridges to library practice and be informed by practitioners and practice. Our understanding and teaching of this issue should include theory, workplace content, and experience.

Despite the fact that there are "two competing cultures" in LIS education--the academic and the professional practitioner (Raber & Connaway, 1996)--there is an opportunity for LIS educators to build community bridges with librarians and library workers to engage in connecting theory and practice about PPSH together. This approach bridges experiential knowledge and theory to

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

engage in praxis and is part of a feminist anti-violence perspective as it argues that, similar to proposition two, communities themselves should be consulted to address the issues that affect them because they are the experts on such matters (Russo, 2018). LIS education about PPSH must include practicing librarians and library workers who should be invited to bring their experiential knowledge, expertise, and theories about PPSH to the classroom. Professional librarians also bring knowledge of, and experience with, library policy, labour relations, management, and workplace health and safety issues to the LIS education which is beyond the purview of most LIS faculty (Singh & Vorbach, 2017). Two ways that LIS educators can engage with practitioners have emerged from our previous workshops and conference presentations: (1) inviting library workers representing a variety of positions from frontline workers to directors and managers to contribute to ongoing conversations about PPSH in LIS classrooms and programs, and (2) for LIS faculty to engage with library workers at practitioner conferences and in professional spaces.

LIS faculty and practitioners can also work together in preparing students for a workplace in which they are vulnerable to PPSH. LIS educators must question whether they are setting up library workers for violence when, in our classrooms, we do not discuss sexual harassment, provide theoretical framing for contextualizing it, or examine ALA or accreditation standards and guidelines, such as RUSA, that may unintentionally perpetuate service orientations that make library workers vulnerable to violence. In addition, if LIS educators neglect to learn about practitioner and student experiences we will not understand the sometimes significant personal and professional consequences for library workers who resist and counter PPSH, and we will not understand the ways that students and library workers develop coping strategies, practical solutions, interventions, and other types of resistance [Please see Proposition 2]. These student-centred considerations exemplify the need for ongoing conversation with library workers and practitioners in preparation for the workplace.

Acknowledging that in many LIS workplaces, the burden of change is often placed on the most powerless such as new graduates and those who are more vulnerable to PPSH is important for LIS educators and practitioners. Newly degreed librarians are in the process of professional enculturation, which emphasizes service, but does not address the complications of LIS' service-orientation that arises in practice, and who may not have a deep understanding of local library policies and procedures, or have access to resources such as labour unions. LIS educators and practitioners can work together to help students and library workers understand local organizational context and library health and safety and incident reporting policies as well as how to create and shape policy in ways that protect all library workers rather than policies that increase surveillance and/or download risk management onto individuals (Farrugia, 2002). What we have learned in our conversations with practitioners are the various ways that people handle incidents while providing reference services, how they work with each other to provide support in difficult moments, and how complicated developing library policy that protects library workers can be.

4. Anti-violence education must be embedded within LIS programs at all levels. This isn't a one class or one topic issue. The problem is embedded and so must the solutions be.

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

A fundamental tenet of feminist anti-violence movements is the insistence that gender-based violence is a collective responsibility held by individuals, communities, and institutions and that social change must therefore be targeted within and across interrelated communites and institutions (Russo, 2018). Embedding anti-violence education across all levels throughout an LIS program is complicated because LIS programs are themselves embedded in larger institutions with unique structures and policies about sexual violence (Ahmed, 2017; Howlett, 2019). Within universities specifically, there is also a growing body of evidence that supports the need for post-secondary institutions to develop comprehensive strategies that recognize this collective responsibility to address sexual violence "in order to create a campus climate where students are willing to report threats of violence, to intervene as bystanders, and to seek support following experiences of sexual violence" (Godderis & Root, 2017). One way LIS faculty can connect sexual violence to graduate movements on campus is by putting information in their course syllabi about campus and community level policies and services regarding sexual violence and harassment (Graham, Mennicke, Rizo, Wood, & Mengo, 2019).

The implications from examining PPSH within the context of anti-violence education extend to LIS faculty and many LIS courses, the overall LIS program, and the curriculum. This raises questions about who is responsible for teaching about sexual harassment in LIS programs, how does this show up in various classes and for different instructors, and how is this work and its attendant emotional labour recognized and evaluated within universities' faculty evaluation committees? At an individual level, some LIS faculty may perceive anti-violence education as "politicized," falsely view their own courses as "neutral," and consequently conclude that this topic is out of scope (Cooke, Sweeney, & Noble, 2016). It is also important to recognize that pedagogy and research related to sexual violence is itself a highly gendered phenomenon. Indeed, "woman-identified instructors and researchers are most likely to have engaged in research and/or advocacy related to the topic, they are most likely to speak about sexual violence in their classes, and they are the individuals who are most likely to receive disclosures from students" (Graham, Mennicke, Rizo, Wood, & Mengo, 2019).

Additionally, LIS educators can integrate relevant materials into their courses such as course readings from within and outside of LIS (e.g., women's and gender studies, organizational studies) and engage in critical readings of ALA value statements and core competencies (Hicks & VanScoy, 2019) and library policies (e.g. patron codes of conduct). Anti-violence education can be addressed via many disciplinary lenses and by working with the broader LIS community [Please see Proposition 3]. Anti-violence education cuts across the curriculum but specific LIS courses may be best suited to address certain specific site and workplace interventions such as, for example, management and human resources (e.g. workplace health and safety including examining the Canada Labour Code on Sexual Harassment), reference and information services (e.g. intersectionality and service provision), research (e.g. use of theory and intersectional frameworks in LIS research and scholarship), and public libraries and community-led librarianship (e.g. cultural competencies, regional and provincial Library Acts). Sexual harassment can be a topic for ongoing discussion during student practicums and internships where students are actively engaged in service learning (Becker, 2000; Meyers, Jensen, & Roy,

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

2009). Embedding intersectional feminist anti-violence education across the curriculum is also an important topic of discussion in curriculum and program reviews.

Conclusion

We have taken up the call to do this work from students. And we acknowledge that there is much more work to do, including continuing to think carefully about how to fully operationalize the four intersectional feminist anti-violence propositions that we are advocating. Indeed, we are slowly beginning our work in this area and alongside our librarian colleagues. However, we recognize that libraries' silence on the pervasive issue of PPSH, as well as LIS education's neglect of theoretical examinations of power structures that inform library labour, make us complicit in the perpetuation of this problem. In the body of this work we offer four propositions, suggested plans of action, that must be further developed together with students, library workers, and LIS instructors. We conclude by raising one final proposition, taken from long time feminist activist and scholar bell hooks, who argues that "when we only name the problem, when we state a complaint without a constructive focus on resolution, we take away hope. In this way critique can become merely an expression of profound cynicism, which then works to sustain dominator culture" (hooks, 2003, p. xiv). Our final call then is for a hope that is generated through both naming the problem for what it is and working together for its resolution, drawing from intersectional feminist voices, anti-violence activist strategies, and classrooms and library spaces full of bright minds, for as bell hooks also notes, "the classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academy" (hooks, 1994, p. 12).

References

Accardi, M. (2013). *Feminist pedagogy for library instruction*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.

Adib, A., & Guerrier, Y. (2003). The interlocking of gender with nationality, race, ethnicity and class: The narratives of women in hotel work. *Gender, Work and Organization, 10*(4), 413-432. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00204.

Allard, D., Lieu, A., & Oliphant, T. (In press). Reading between the lines: An environmental scan of writing about third-party sexual harassment in the LIS literature and beyond. *The Library Quarterly.*

Allard, D., Oliphant, T. & Lieu, A. (2019, October). Disrupting patron-perpetrated sexual harassment in libraries: An intersectional analysis. Research at the Intersections of Gender. University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2019, September). *If the doors could talk: Diversity, complaint, and institutions.* Talk presented at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

American Library Association Reference and User Services Division (2019). Guidelines for Behavioral Performance of Reference and Information Service Providers. Retrieved from: http://www.ala.org/rusa/resources/guidelines/guidelinesbehavioral.

Baker, C. N. (2008). *The women's movement against sexual harassment*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Becker, N. J. (2000). Service learning in the curriculum: Preparing LIS students for the next

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

millennium. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 41*(4), 285-293.
Bond, C. E. (2017). Catcalling and the college classroom: A model for teaching students about street harassment. *Feminist Teacher, 27*(2-3), 211-232.
Bromley. V. (2012). *Feminisms matter: Debates, theories, activism.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
Buchwald, E., Fletcher, P., & Roth, M. (1993). *Transforming a rape culture*. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.
Chou, R. L., & Pho, A. (2017). Intersectionality at the reference desk: Lived experiences of women of color librarians. In M.T. Accardi (Ed.), *The feminist reference desk: Concepts, critiques, and conversations* (pp. 225-252). Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.
Combahee River Collective. (1977). Combahee River Collective Statement. Retrieved from https://combaheerivercollective.weebly.com/the-combahee-river-collective-statement.html
Cooke, N. A., Sweeney, M. E., & Noble, S. U. (2016). Social justice as topic and tool: An attempt to transform an LIS curriculum and culture, *Library Quarterly, 86*(1), 107-124. https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/684147
Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine. *Feminist Theory and Anti-racist Politics, 1,* Retrieved from http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8
DeWitt, M. (2017, September). Sexual harassment in the library: When patrons are the perpetrators. *Hack Library School*. Retrieved from: https://hacklibraryschool.com/2017/09/11/27088/.
Emmelhainz, C., Pappas, E., & Seale, M. (2017). Behavioural expectations for the mommy librarian: The successful reference transaction as emotional labor. In M.T. Accardi (Ed.), *The feminist reference desk: Concepts, critiques, and conversations,* (pp. 27-46). Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.
Ettarh, F. (2018). Vocational awe and librarianship: The lies we tell ourselves. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe.* Retrieved from http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2018/vocational-awe/
Farrugia, S. (2002). A dangerous occupation? Violence in public libraries. *New Library World, 103*(9), 309-319.
Gilliland, A. J. (2011). Neutrality, social justice, and the obligations of archival education and educators in the Twenty-First Century. *Archival Science, 11*(3/4), 193–209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10502-011-9147-0
Godderis, R., & Root, J. L. (2017). Addressing sexual violence on post-secondary campuses is a collective responsibility. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal, 9*(3), 1-9.
Government of Canada. (2016). *Sexual harassment*. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/programs/employment-standards/federal-standards/sexual-harrassment.html
Graham, L. M., Mennicke, A., Rizo, C. F., Woods, L., & Mengo, C. W. (2019). Interpersonal violence prevention and response on college and university campuses: Opportunities for faculty leadership. *Journal of Family Violence,* 34, 189–198. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-018-9968-1

Harris, R. (1992). *Librarianship: The erosion of a woman's profession*. 1992. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
Hathcock, A. (2015). White librarianship in blackface: Diversity initiatives in LIS. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe.* Retrieved from: http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/
Hicks, D., & VanScoy, A. (2019). Discourses of expertise in professional competency documents: Reference expertise as performance. *Library Quarterly, 89*(1), 34-53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/700662
Higgins, S. (2017). Embracing the feminization of librarianship. In S. Lew & B. Yousefi (Eds.), *Feminists among us: Resistance and advocacy in library leadership* (67-91). Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.
Hildenbrand, S. (2000). Library feminism and library women's history: Activism and scholarship, equity and culture. *Libraries & Culture, 35*(1), 51-65.
Honma, T. (2005). Trippin' over the color line: The invisibility of race in library and information studies. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 1*(2), 1-26.
hooks, b. (1994). *Outlaw culture: Resisting representations.* New York: Routledge.
hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.
Howlett, C. (2019). Stop being so melodramatic! Or, the problem with sexual harassment policies. *Educational Theory, 69*(1), 127-139.
Jensen, K. (2017, October). The state of sexual harassment in the library. *Book Riot*. Retrieved from https://bookriot.com/2017/10/24/sexual-harassment-library/
Keer, G., & Carlos, A. (2014). The stereotype stereotype: Our obsession with librarian representation. In Nicole Pagowsky & Miriam Rigby (Eds.), *The librarian stereotype: Deconstructing perceptions and presentations of information work* (pp. 63-83). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.
Lange, E., & Young, S. (2019). Gender-based violence as difficult knowledge: Pedagogies for rebalancing the masculine and the feminine. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 38*(3), 301-326. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2019.1597932
Lorde, A. (1984). Age, race, class, and sex: Women redefining difference. In *Sister outsider: Essays & speeches*, (pp. 114-123). Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.
Lux, K. M., Hutcheson, J. B., & Peden, A. R. (2014). Ending disruptive behavior: Staff nurse recommendations to nurse educators. *Nurse Education in Practice, 14*(1), 37–42.
MacBride, K. (2018, January). #TimesUp on harassing your public librarian. *Shondaland*. Retrieved from https://www.shondaland.com/act/a15876574/timesup-on-harassing-your-public-librarian/
MacKinnon, C. A. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Meyers, A. H., Jensen, K., & Roy, L. (Eds). (2009). *Service learning: Linking library education and practice.* Chicago: ALA Editions of the American Library Association.
Natarajan, V. (2017). Nostalgia, cuteness, and geek chic: Whiteness in Orla Kiely's *Library.* In G. Schlesselman-Tarango (Ed.), *Topographies of whiteness: Mapping whiteness in library and information science,* (pp. 121-142). Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Oliphant, T., Allard, D. & Lieu, A. (2019, April) *Part of the job: Dealing with third party harassment in Libraries*. Presented at the Alberta Library Conference, Jasper, AB.
Pagowsky, N., & Rigby, M. (2014). *The librarian stereotype: Deconstructing perceptions and presentations of information work.* Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.
Pawley, C. (2006). Unequal legacies: Race and multiculturalism in the LIS curriculum. *Library Quarterly, 76*(2), 149–168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/506955
Ontario Tourism Education Corporation. (2017). It's your shift. Online training modules. Retrieved from: https://www.otec.org/Training-Solutions-Overview/Its-Your-Shift.aspx.
Raber, D., & Connaway, L. S. (1996). Two cultures, one faculty: Contradictions of Library and Information Science Education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 37*(2), 120-130.
Roberts, S. T., & Noble, S. U. (2016). Empowered to name, inspired to act: Social responsibility and diversity as calls to action in the LIS context. *Library Trends, 64*(3), 512-532. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lib.2016.0008
Root, J., & Godderis, R. (2016). Instructor strategies for responding to disclosures of gender-based violence on campus. *Canadian Journal of Action Research, 17*(3), 3-19.
Russo, A. (2018). *Feminist accountability: Disrupting violence and transforming power*. NYU Press.
Schlesselman-Tarango, G. (2016). The legacy of Lady Bountiful: White women in the library. *Library Trends*, *64*(4), 667-686. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lib.2016.0015
Schlesselman-Tarango, G. (2017). How cute! Race, gender, and neutrality in libraries. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library & Information Practice & Research*, *12*(1), 1–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v12i1.3850
Senn, C. Y., Eliasziw, M., Barata, P. C., Thurston, W. E., Newby-Clark, I. R., Radtke, H. L. & Hobden, K. L. (2015). Efficacy of a sexual assault resistance program for university women. *New England Journal of Medicine, 372,* 2326-2335. http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1411131
Singh, R., & J. Vorbach. (2017). Re-envisioning management education and training for information professionals. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 58*(2), 95-105. http://dx.doi.org/10.12783/issn.2328-2967/58/2/4
Sullivan, M. (2018, December 14). Sacramento librarian slain; suspect had been banned from library. *Sacramento Bee*. Retrieved from: https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/12/14/sacramento-librarian-slain-suspect-had-been-banned-from-library/
Taylor, E. A., Jones, G. J., McCray, K., & R. Hardin. (2019). Creating ethical decision makers: The influence of education on perceptions of sexual harassment and sexual assault. *Sport Management Education Journal, 13*, 73-82. https://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2019-0004
Taylor, E. A., & Paule-Koba, A. "It's our responsibility": Examining the integration of sexual harassment and assault education in sport management programs. *Sport Management Education Journal, 14*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2019-0034
Watson, M. (2017). White feminism and distribution of power in academic libraries. In G. Schlesselman-Tarango (Ed.), *Topographies of whiteness: Mapping whiteness in library and information science* (pp. 175-202). Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/JCIE
doi 10.20355/jcie29390

Wood, L., & Moylan, C. (2017). “No one talked about it”: Social work field placements and sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Work Education, (53)*4, 714-726. https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2017.1283270

Yagil, D. (2008). When the customer is wrong: A review of research on aggression and sexual harassment in service encounters. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*(2), 141–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.03.002.

Yogaretnam, S. (2018, May 25). Police ask for public’s help after librarian sexually assaulted in city's 13th homicide of 2018. *Ottawa Citizen.* Retrieved from: https://ottawacitizen.com/news/local-news/police-ask-for-publics-help-after-librarian-sexually-assaulted-in-citys-13th-homicide-of-2018/