

Feminized Flexibility, One-Shot, and Library Professionalism: Oxymoron or Opportunity?

Yi Ding

What perceived role do one-shot information literacy sessions play in the professional status of librarianship? In what way is this perception resulting from and contributing to the feminization of instructional labor? How will criticizing and/or changing one-shots disrupt or perpetuate gender and other forms of inequity? All these questions demand historical, theoretical, intersectional, and practical examination to inform equitable instructional models and pedagogies in academic librarianship. In this article, the author discusses one-shots' impact on academic library instruction as feminized labor by theorizing manifestations and perceptions of flexibility. By reimagining professionalism with a feminist and intersectional lens, the author concludes that destigmatizing gender stereotypes in imposed flexibility and embracing practices of autonomous flexibility in one-shots are key for library instructors and administrators to advance both workplace and student equity.

Author Positionality: How I Came to This Topic

In my current role coordinating library online instruction, designing alternative pedagogy and instructional materials to engage students in information literacy education other than in-person one-shot sessions has always been my professional responsibility. However, when reflecting on the connections and conflicts between one-shots, feminization, and professional-ism, I constantly question my motivations behind these efforts and my positionality as a female librarian of color, a scholar mother, and the youngest untenured faculty member at my library. My critique of the gendered view of professionalism and flexibility stemmed from my own anxiety to seek recognition from students, faculty members, and colleagues as a junior professional sometimes through overworking, innovating for its own sake, and gathering quantitative data with few in-depth conversations with patrons. Reading literature on “flexibility penalty,” which will be discussed later in this article, reminded me of my stress and burnout during and after maternity leave to handle my one-shot sessions. As a first-generation Asian American immigrant who almost dropped out of college due to financial burdens, I also value the intersectional perspective to understand LIS in light of racial, gender, and class identities and inequities. My institution is developing our first credit-bearing information literacy course, and I hope my intellectual inquiry can guide my engagement in the envisioning, implementation, and evaluation of an equitable instructional model.

**Yi Ding is Online Instruction Coordinator, University Library at California State University, Northridge, email: yi.ding@csun.edu. © 2022 Yi Ding, Attribution-NonCommercial (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) CC BY-NC.*

Background: Contextualizing “One-Shot” through Feminized “Flexibility” and Masculinized “Professionalism”

In library and information science (LIS), the one-shot refers to the most prevalent library instructional model that is brief, single-session, and often skill-based.¹ Even though some positive student learning outcomes of one-shot sessions have been identified in different studies,² this model is often considered a shortcoming of librarians' teaching and even a cause for systemic problems of the profession.³ Scholars have acknowledged that the term is used to demonstrate “the futility” of library instructional sessions,⁴ which are criticized for not cultivating an understanding of the complex research process.⁵ The negative connotations of “one-shot” has distinctive significance in academic librarianship as a loaded term since it suggests a critique of its detriment to identity and status of the whole profession, not just student learning outcomes. Although LIS professionals have been conducting studies to improve one-shot sessions,⁶ library instructors are aware of the universally negative connotation of “one-shot.” We use the term often when criticizing this instructional model with colleagues, but rarely when communicating with a general audience about expectations of library instruction.

Although these scholarly discussions and views held by practitioners are valuable, few articles have contextualized existing critiques or one-shots through an equity lens. Among these few, Nicholson builds on Drabinski's insights on the connection between time, capital, and academic librarianship labor, and provides a valuable time lens in pinpointing the systemic problems of one-shots.⁷ The short amount of time of both one-shot sessions themselves and of response time for last-minute instructional requests from disciplinary faculty are considered as evidence of the commodification of information literacy teaching labor at neoliberal universities where efficiency is always prioritized.⁸

Other than temporality, no other features of one-shots have been extensively conceptualized, among which flexibility is an important one. To elaborate, when discussing pedagogical approaches required by “corporate time,” Nicholson mentions the significance of “flexible delivery and pace,”⁹ but like other LIS scholars, she does not explore more about flexibility in LIS and one-shots. This might be unsurprising to most people, as discussions of flexible management and workplace flexibility in LIS, especially since the COVID-19 pandemic,¹⁰ seem to have portrayed flexibility as positively perceived in librarianship. It may seem counterintuitive to connect critiques of one-shots to flexibility. However, as Nicholson notes, flexibility is an important requirement in neoliberal universities to ensure students acquire skills as customers. Also, it is important to make a distinction in labor studies between employer-led flexibility (that is, imposed flexibility) and employee-led flexibility (in other words, autonomous flexibility), with the former demanded by others and negatively correlated with work-life balance and pay and the latter honoring individual choice and generally beneficial for workers and retention of employees.¹¹ Therefore, to fully understand one-shots in neoliberal universities, we need to critically examine manifestations and perceptions of flexibility in library instructional labor.

Interestingly, there are gendered connotations of “flexibility” in professional settings including LIS, and these connotations are interconnected to disproportionately negative associations of “feminization,” a phenomenon extensively discussed in LIS. Specifically, whether advocating for “workplace flexibility,”¹² meaning giving female employees more autonomy over the number and means of working hours, or critiquing the “flexibility penalty,”¹³ meaning female employees are penalized for requesting flexible work arrangements, scholars have always associated flexibility with female needs and challenges at the workplace. Men

who seek flexibility at the workplace may be stigmatized as less masculine.¹⁴ Likewise, while feminization could indicate *numerical* increase of the participation of women “in a context traditionally reserved for men,”¹⁵ when social sciences scholars discuss concerns with some professions including librarianship as semiprofessions, feminization is often attributed to or blamed for and thus imbued with a *symbolic*, negative meaning.¹⁶

Feminization and professionalism of the teaching field can inform our understanding of this gendered perception of flexibility. Literature on the feminization of teaching has critical discussions on the dichotomic perceptions of teacher professionalism in contrast to that of educational experts. Notably, perceptions of flexibility played an important role in this difference. For example, married women were not allowed into the teaching profession until the mid-1900s, and it was not a dedication to career ambition that was highlighted in public discourses about *numerical* increase of female teachers. Instead, what justified feminization was the fact that teaching integrated well with motherhood, due to a more flexible schedule and tasks with nurturing values also demonstrated in childrearing.¹⁷ Just as Grumet advocates for the subtle, flexible responsive language to children in teaching,¹⁸ qualities associated with flexibility such as sensitivity and caring in teaching have also been inevitably feminized (symbolic feminization) during the transition of more women entering the workforce (numerical feminization). Historically, teaching was considered a feminized profession that emphasized morality of the teachers to adapt to students’ changing needs rather than disciplining students to follow set rules. Teachers were considered “second mothers....and flexible workers”¹⁹ and flexible work structure in turn indicates a “feminine work arrangement.”²⁰ For decades, flexibility, instead of rigor, which is culturally associated with masculinity,²¹ dominated characteristics perceived of effective teachers and remains an important pedagogy.²² This focus on flexibility does not mean that teachers are not required to deliver rigorous *content* to students, but that they are socially recognized as most effective when being adaptable to student needs in the *method* of such delivery, such as by demonstrating empathy and multiple ways of engagement, especially to students who are in particular situations or need to cultivate independent learning skills.²³ These gendered perceptions of flexibility and rigor also do not indicate a normative dichotomy between rigor and flexibility. For example, culturally responsive teaching, which encourages flexibility in teaching such as through providing flexible scaffolding without rigid structure, aims to enhance “authentic engagement and rigor.”²⁴

These gendered perceptions in teaching resonates with the perceived conflict between masculine-coded professionalism in other fields and feminized identity of the library profession. The perceived lack of professional expertise resulted in the coining of the term “semi-profession” by sociologists to describe teaching, social work, nursing, and library-keeping.²⁵ The idea of a “semi-profession” is prevalent in Garrison’s influential feminist analysis of the history of library work in that there is no “clear-cut conception of professional rights and responsibilities.”²⁶ This parallels with how professionalism is often associated with masculine-coded behaviors such as enacting rigid standards and making decisions as experts for clients instead of serving their changing needs.²⁷ As such, manifestations of flexibility in a profession may be considered contrary to the strict rules and responsibilities as well as the autonomy and status of other professions. As Garrison discusses, feminine values were associated with library work to reconcile the inconsistent value between individualism traditionally celebrated by male professionals and altruism traditionally expected of women, especially mothers. In this way, newly feminized occupations including the library field and teaching consider altru-

ism as both innate in women and important to the profession. Feminized professional values including altruism, which correlates with flexibility by definition and based on empirical research,²⁸ resulted in the stereotype of skills required in these professions as being natural, which justified their low compensation and status.²⁹ Just as success is measured not by promotion to higher levels in teaching, libraries are misperceived by many to be sacred places of “vocational awe” that justify the contribution and even sacrifice of library workers with low compensation.³⁰ Both concepts of flexibility and professionalism gain gendered connotations, with the former being feminized and the latter masculinized.

Therefore, to advance equity goals in LIS, we need to pinpoint the concept of flexibility by revisiting professionalism in the one-shot instructional model through a feminist lens. With existing literature focusing on one-shots but not feminized perceptions of one-shots, it is particularly important to examine critiques of one-shots in the overall perception of the library profession beyond the time lens to supplement existing feminist analyses of status and labor in LIS.³¹ This article fills a gap of theorizing the tensions between librarians’ professionalism, feminization, and flexibility through an intersectional analysis of the one-shot model. The author will argue that disrupting gendered stereotypes of flexibility in one-shots is key to the advancement of racial, gender, and class equities in LIS both for library instructors and for patrons.

Analytical Lens: The Reproductive/Productive Labor Dichotomy in Academic Librarianship

The unique status of academic librarians is our higher education professional setting where most other instructors are disciplinary faculty teaching credit-bearing courses, many of whom also produce research. Due to perceived limitations in teaching time, pedagogy, and content, it is not surprising that the one-shot model has often been contrasted with the for-credit model by many LIS scholars. The for-credit model is considered beneficial to not only achieve more intellectually rigorous student learning outcomes, but also improve the teaching status of academic librarians on par with other instructors in higher education.³² When problematizing the professional status of academic librarians in contrast to that of credit-bearing course teaching faculty, scholars often apply the framework of Marxist feminist theory on the divide between reproductive and productive labor, with the former often referring to instruction and service and the latter scholarship.³³ The concept of reproductive labor is core to discussion of gender inequality in Marxist feminism as it frames the devaluation of feminized labor belonging to the domestic sphere and with less utilitarian value to the society.³⁴ Similarly, feminists have attributed the gender pay gap to the undervaluation of service work as rote, unskilled labor and/or as take-for-granted labor that nurturing women could naturally do for free.³⁵ Just as teaching is seen as natural to women as discussed in the last section, instructional librarians could be perceived as natural teachers to help and support others, which justifies the low status, autonomy, care, and even compensation of their one-shot instructional labor as in domestic work and the teaching profession.³⁶

It could be argued that, since most one-shot sessions only involve interactions between instructional librarians and students during one class period, it is understandable that no creative pedagogy, in-depth content, or seriousness of the topic could be established, and the professional status of librarians is undermined because of this time restraint. How-

ever, disciplinary faculty frequently invite guest speakers to lecture, and they are treated as experts rather than merely service providers, and they are even applauded for adding innovation, engagement, and relevance to the classroom.³⁷ Flexibility in the one-shot model can explain this distinction of treatment. Specifically, in contrast to credit courses taught by domain experts who are compensated based on a set number of classes to teach, who have the autonomy to develop content and include formal student assessment, and are evaluated by students at the end of the course, one-shot session instructors must cater to the schedule and content needs of the class instructors who request the one-shots and rarely conduct assessment or receive evaluations in every session. In contrast to guest lecturers who have the autonomy to opt in or out and decide on delivery content and pedagogy, library instructors are expected to be available to teach as needed about skills to complete specific research assignments often designed solely by course instructors.³⁸ This manifestation of flexibility in the time, amount, compensation, and feedback of labor provided in one-shot sessions mirrors traits of domestic labor done by women, demonstrating feminine qualities discussed earlier such as altruism and further corroborating the aforementioned feminized perception of flexibility that leads to low status. Flexibility is further demonstrated in the perceived highly scalable and transferable content covered in one-shot sessions, making this type of instructional labor easily categorized as repetitive labor like other reproductive labor.

Just as reproductive labor is undervalued and abused in a patriarchal system, flexibility is deemed important for the efficient operation of a neoliberal system, but it could be imposed by employers and not equitably compensated for or driven by employees. When suggesting alternative models to one-shots, some practitioners suggest approaches such as a programmatic or consultancy model where librarians can contribute to the for-credit course content, pedagogy, and time allocated to library instruction.³⁹ What these different approaches share is autonomy, which aligns with the autonomous flexibility in contrast to the imposed flexibility. Specifically, imposed flexibility is to accommodate the schedule, content, and pedagogy needs of teaching faculty due to asymmetrical power dynamics between librarians and teaching faculty⁴⁰ or that between librarians and administrators' or institutional need of efficiency, but librarians need autonomous flexibility to determine the means and amount of instructional labor. The biased perception that feminized flexibility could undermine masculinized professionalism in one-shots may lead to imposed flexibility as it fuels the narrative that instructors of one-shots are less professional and do not require autonomy.

This bias may also exacerbate misconceptions on how people assess dissatisfaction, stress, and burnout in instruction that leads to harm of librarian well-being. When debunking the myth of vocational awe, Ettarh warns that unjust expectations of the feminized library profession can lead to or exacerbate burnout.⁴¹ Imposed flexibility is a form of unjust expectation rooted in gendered perception of teaching, library labor, and flexibility. Just like female depression and burnout in reproductive labor are downplayed and there is a systemic prejudice dismissing the physical pain of women in the medical field,⁴² biased perception toward flexibility of one-shots might also undermine the legitimacy of instructional librarians to feel or express any concern with their own well-being. Instructional librarians might feel more pressured to fulfill unjust expectations of imposed flexibility, leading to stress, enforcing the patriarchal academic system when there's a threat (expression of dissatisfaction, stress, or burnout), and creating a vicious cycle of burnout.

Intersectional Lens: Library Instruction and Race, Class, and Other Marginalized Identities

While a feminist analysis is helpful to dissect the gendered flexibility demonstrated by one-shots, it is also important to consider other forms of inequities in understanding feminized library instruction labor.⁴³ First, LIS is not immune to the classist belief in a binary between skilled and unskilled labor in neoliberal market and immigration policies and discourses.⁴⁴ The perception that one-shots are intrinsically less rigorous than other instructional models due to demonstrated flexibility in time, content, and pedagogy may reinforce both gender and class inequities. The attribution of reproductive labor to be unskilled correlates with women's low class and parallels the extensive discussion on the negative impact of one-shots on librarian status blaming feminization. Moreover, the gendered stigmatization male professionals face in female-dominated professions including librarianship is more prevalent in low-status jobs and can further exacerbate the gender and class segregation in these professions.⁴⁵

Second, the inequity caused by bias toward flexibility and stigma over one-shots may disproportionately impact instruction librarians of color and other minority groups. Although the previous section discusses a universal detriment of downplaying emotional labor to instruction librarians, research has shown that minority academic librarians tend to respond to racial and ethnic stereotypes with overworking and vocational awe.⁴⁶ Specifically, minority academic librarians may not only overwork to "prove ...expertise," but also engage in behaviors to mitigate the influence and demonstration of "emotional responses ...interests, relationships, values."⁴⁷ As such, minority academic librarians might be more inclined to agree to last-minute instructional requests of library workshops and be more reluctant to negotiate instructional content and pedagogies as a way to accommodate patron needs or to avoid emotional responses. These behaviors can be considered demonstration of flexibility, which is stigmatized as feminine and therefore less valuable than rigorous work, adding to the existing gender bias as well as gendered racial identities such as feminization imposed on Asian Americans⁴⁸ and masculinization imposed on Black Americans.⁴⁹

Practical Lens: The Value of One-Shots and Flexibility

Many LIS researchers and instructors have asserted various pedagogical and programmatic suggestions to provide supplemental or alternative teaching models to the one-shot.⁵⁰ There were even grassroots efforts to resist teaching one-shots altogether to push for faculty partnerships.⁵¹ How will different strategies and the perceptions underlining them disrupt or reinforce gender and other forms of inequities, for both academic librarians and students?

Since the first wave feminist movement, there has been a division of ideas on whether femininity should be celebrated as an asset of the female professional or minimized as a cause of inequality.⁵² Similarly, some LIS scholars suggested both altering the one-shot instructional model and reframing the pervasive perceptions of library work including instruction as service to notions of librarians as partners, experts, and even education reform leaders.⁵³ On the other hand, others have advocated for librarians to embrace the feminization of librarianship by making visible and celebrating our reproductive work to disrupt neoliberal goals.⁵⁴ A redefinition of professionalism, which is masculine-coded as in contrast to feminized librarianship, one-shot instruction, and flexibility, is helpful to reconcile these two approaches. Scholars have elaborated on some manifestations of professionalism to be domain knowledge, autonomy, mission to serve clients, positive relations with other professionals in the field, and code of

ethics.⁵⁵ How do we advance gender and other forms of equities by revisiting the role of flexibility in professionalism in one-shots? This practical section will recommend principles for LIS practitioners to consider when implementing different strategies to combat deprofessionalism, described by scholars in academic institutions to signify the distance from professional values for the sake of business outcomes.⁵⁶

First, recognizing the value of flexibility in one-shots is important to advancing equitable student learning outcomes and university culture that align with our professional mission. Combating devaluation of feminized labor that the one-shot model represents should not mean a rejection of the entire model, especially the service component. Otherwise, by refuting and devaluing the flexibility and service nature of library instruction, we might be diminishing the value of service labor of other staff members in academia including library staff and reinforcing the class and racial hierarchy. While it is true that the short length of one-shots could limit librarians' ability to cultivate domain knowledge, it could provide flexibility beneficial for the well-being and success of students, library instructors, and universities. Literature has extensive discussions on benefits of a flexibility culture in the workplace to both employees and employers, especially to the retention and promotion of marginalized employees, and flexible pedagogy and schedules in the LIS field could particularly benefit outreach to marginalized communities.⁵⁷ In teaching theories, flexibility supported by effective pedagogies including Universal Design for Learning is crucial for inclusive learning.⁵⁸ One important trend during the pandemic was to balance rigor, which has been traditionally emphasized in higher education, and flexibility.⁵⁹ As Accardi notes, the low status of librarians paradoxically affords "more freedom to experiment" with pedagogy than credit-bearing course instructors, and the one-shot model "has more flexibility that progressive librarians can take advantage of."⁶⁰ For all these reasons, library instructors should embrace manifestations of flexibility in one-shots and apply flexible pedagogy that best fits diverse teaching styles and student needs.⁶¹

To achieve this goal, it is important to distinguish between imposed flexibility and autonomous flexibility, with only the latter affording library instructors with autonomy and benefiting library instructors with marginalized gender, race, age, class, and other statuses.⁶² In addition to the benefits of autonomous flexibility, researchers have found a negative association between occupational burnout and psychological flexibility defined as the ability to "be aware of and accept thoughts and feelings at the present moment, and at the same time, to act according to one's own values and goals."⁶³ Recognizing the value of one-shots and that of flexibility will provide a more supportive environment to increase psychological flexibility, which could reduce burnout. In the case of the one-shot, it is important for library instructors to feel comfortable to discuss not only flexible schedule, but also other pedagogical values and goals with disciplinary faculty and supervisors. To achieve this, libraries should have instruction request guidelines that set expectations of time (for instance, two weeks' minimum arrangement time, length, and number of sessions), method (such as in-person vs. online, pedagogy, technological tools), and content (for example, skills covered, academic freedom) for disciplinary faculty. Ultimately, flexibility of library instructors should be autonomous and valued, not imposed and demanded. The guidelines must allow for negotiation and mutually agreed-upon terms and benefit both the disciplinary and library instructors.

This approach requires a holistic understanding of librarianship professionalism on an administrative and institutional level that transcends and expands its current masculine characteristics to prevent library professionals from falling into deprofessionalism. Since the

bureaucratic control in deprofessionalization is considered both as contrary to professionalism and as a result from an overrationalization of organization that contrasts with emphasis of emotional and relational labor often associated with women, it follows that professionalism celebrating feminine labor and values is key to maintaining high engagement of professionals and quality of work. Just as teacher professionalism could be understood differently from more masculine-coded professionalism to be about effective education with “mutual respect, love, loyalty, harmony and cooperation,”⁶⁴ autonomous flexibility can enable academic library professionals to exhibit high skills adaptive to diverse academic, civic, and emotional needs of patrons, of themselves, as well as changes in the world the library profession is situated in.

Conclusion

The quality of flexibility in librarianship demonstrated by one-shots can lead to a perceived lack of commitment to serious professional identity and intellectual rigor. This perception results in many critiques of one-shots, which overlook the importance of flexibility in educational equity and workplace equity. Worse, together with the feminization of teaching and librarianship, this perception may exacerbate the gender stereotype of and the class, racial, and other inequities within the profession. We should take an intersectional approach to reframe the feminization and subsequent devaluation of library work represented by one-shots as an opportunity for instructional librarians to revisit imposed flexibility and embrace autonomous flexibility in one-shots and instruction labor.

Teaching exclusively one-shots could indicate an institutional inertia to support student needs, but criticizing all one-shots and suggesting alternative models or new pedagogies could also be driven by a dichotomic understanding of productive/reproductive and skilled/unskilled labor, an anxiety to innovate at the expense of real patron needs and library instructor well-being, and ultimately an expediency to avoid nuances in feminist endeavors. The COVID-19 pandemic has created new challenges and opportunities for educators to rethink effective teaching and for administrators to rethink leadership to support student, staff, and organizational success. In leadership theories, one important trend is to transition from the Newtonian, linear way of chasing predictability and efficiency, to the quantum, dynamic way of embracing flexibility and interconnectedness.⁶⁵ We need to reach a holistic understanding of professionalism with nuanced distinctions yet connectedness between values and interests of organizations, of professions, of professional organizations, of professionals, and of patrons. By allowing for, advocating for, and ultimately celebrating autonomous flexibility in one-shots, we can advance student and LIS equity and reach a holistic understanding of professionalism with feminist values.

Notes

1. Margaret Artman, Erica Frisicaro-Pawłowski, and Robert Monge, “Not Just One Shot: Extending the Dialogue about Information Literacy in Composition Classes,” *Composition Studies* 38, no. 2 (2010): 94.

2. E. Stewart Saunders, “The Effect of Bibliographic Instruction on the Demand for Reference Services,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 3, no. 1 (2003): 35-3-9; Gabrielle Wong, Diana Chan, and Sam Chu, “Assessing the Enduring Impact of Library Instruction Programs,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 4 (2003): 384-95; Chris A. Portmann and Adrienne Julius Roush, “Assessing the Effects of Library Instruction,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 30, no. 6 (2004): 461-65.

3. Yvonne Mery, Jill Newby, and Ke Peng, 2012. “Why One-Shot Information Literacy Sessions Are Not the Future of Instruction: A Case for Online Credit Courses,” *College & Research Libraries* 73, no. 4 (2012): 366-77, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-271>.

4. Artman, Frisicaro-Pawlowski, and Monge, "Not Just One Shot," 93–110; Melissa Bowles-Terry and Carrie Donovan, "Serving Notice on the One-Shot: Changing Roles for Instruction Librarians," *International Information & Library Review* 48, no. 2 (2016): 137–42, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1176457>; Christine Moeller, "Insert Instruction Here: The Impact of the Service Model on Authentic Teaching," in *Deconstructing Service in Libraries: Intersections of Identities and Expectations*, eds. Joanna Gadsby and Veronica Arellano Douglas (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books, LLC, 2020), 237 [accessed 9 February 2022].
5. Artman, Frisicaro-Pawlowski, and Monge, "Not Just One Shot"; Nicole Pagowsky, "The Contested One-Shot: Deconstructing Power Structures to Imagine New Futures," *College & Research Libraries* 82, no. 3 (2021): 301, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.82.3.300>; Michael Carlozzi, "They Found It—Now Do They Bother? An Analysis of First-Year Synthesis," *College & Research Libraries* 79, no. 5 (2018): 660.
6. Heidi L.M. Jacobs and Dale Jacobs, "Transforming the One-Shot Library Session into Pedagogical Collaboration: Information Literacy and the English Composition Class," *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (2009): 72–82, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20865180>.
7. Karen P. Nicholson, "'Being in Time': New Public Management, Academic Librarians, and the Temporal Labor of Pink-Collar Public Service Work," *Library Trends* 68, no. 2 (2019): 130–52, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2019.0034>.
8. Nicholson, "Being in Time."
9. *Critical Library Pedagogy Handbook: Essays and Workbook Activities*, eds. Nicole Pagowsky and Kelly McElroy (Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2016), 30.
10. Anne Goulding and Evelyn Kerslake, "Flexible Working in Libraries: Profit and Potential Pitfalls," *Library Management* 17, no. 2 (1996): 8–16, <https://doi.org/10.1108/01435129610108225>; Michael A. Germano, "Does Workplace Inflexibility Cost Libraries? Library Worklife," <https://ala-apa.org/newsletter/2010/03/28/does-workplace-inflexibility-cost-libraries/> [accessed 24 February 2022]; Mihoko Hosoi, Lauren Reiter, and Diane Zabel, "Reshaping Perspectives on Flexible Work: The Impact of COVID-19 on Academic Library Management," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 21, no. 4 (2021): 695–713, <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2021.0038>.
11. Alex J. Wood, "Flexible Scheduling, Degradation of Job Quality and Barriers to Collective Voice," *Human Relations* 69, no. 10 (2016): 1989–2010; E.E. Kossek, B.A. Lautsch, and S.C. Eaton, "Flexibility Enactment Theory: Implications of Flexibility Type, Control, and Boundary Management for Work-Family Effectiveness," in *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives* (Hove, UK: Psychology Press, 2005).
12. Vicki Schultz, "Feminism and Workplace Flexibility," *Connecticut Law Review* 42 (2009): 1203.
13. Christin L. Munsch, "Flexible Work, Flexible Penalties: The Effect of Gender, Childcare, and Type of Request on the Flexibility Bias," *Social Forces* 94, no. 4 (2016): 1567–91, <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sov122>; Daniel Wheatley, "Employee Satisfaction and Use of Flexible Working Arrangements," *Work, Employment and Society* 31, no. 4 (2017): 567–85, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017016631447>.
14. Joseph A. Vandello et al., "When Equal Isn't Really Equal: The Masculine Dilemma of Seeking Work Flexibility," *Journal of Social Issues* 69, no. 2 (2013): 303–21.
15. Gabriele Griffin, "Feminization," in *A Dictionary of Gender Studies* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2017), www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191834837.001.0001/acref-9780191834837-e-129.
16. Roma M. Harris, "Gender, Power, and the Dangerous Pursuit of Professionalism," *American Libraries* 24, no. 9 (1993): 874–76; Sharon Bolton and Daniel Muzio, "The Paradoxical Processes of Feminization in the Professions: The Case of Established, Aspiring and Semi-Professions," *Work, Employment and Society* 22, no. 2 (2008): 281–99, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017008089105>.
17. Elizabeth Boyle, "The Feminization of Teaching in America," Louis Kempf Writing Prize Essay (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004).
18. Madeleine R. Grumet, *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 164.
19. Gustavo E. Fischman, "Persistence and Ruptures: The Feminization of Teaching and Teacher Education in Argentina," *Gender & Education* 19, no. 3 (2007): 353–68, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250701295502>.
20. Sarah A. Robert, "Incentives, Teachers, and Gender at Work," *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 21, no. 31 (2013), <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1128>.
21. Julie A. Nelson, "Feminism and Economics." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9, no. 2 (1995): 131–48, <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.9.2.131>.
22. John Zahorik, "Stability and Flexibility in Teaching," *Teaching and Teacher Education* 6, no. 1 (1990): 69–80, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(90\)90008-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(90)90008-S); Christopher Yakes and Jon R. Star, 2011. "Using Comparison to Develop Flexibility for Teaching Algebra," *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education* 14, no. 3 (1990): 175–91, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-009-9131-2>.
23. Leila Christenbury, "The Flexible Teacher," *Educational Leadership* 68, no. 4 (2011): 46–50; Jo Kehoe, Beth Tennant, and Karen Becker, "The Challenge of Flexible and Non-Traditional Learning and Teaching Methods:

- Best Practice in Every Situation?" *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development* 1, no. 1 (2004): 56–63.
24. Zaretta Hammond, *Culturally Responsive Teaching and The Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2014), 150.
25. Richard L. Simpson and Ida M. Simpson, "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semi-Professions," in *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*, ed. A. Etzioni (New York, NY: Free Press, 1969), 196–265.
26. Dee Garrison, "The Tender Technicians: The Feminization of Public Librarianship, 1876–1905," *Journal of Social History* 6, no. 2 (1972): 145.
27. Heather Seminelli, "Librarian as Professional," *Serials Librarian* 71, no. 1 (2016): 64, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2016.1168667>.
28. Ismail Yelpeze and Levent Yakar, "The Relationship between Altruism and Life Satisfaction: Mediator Role of Cognitive Flexibility," *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal* 49, no. 1 (2020): 142–62, <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1069805>.
29. Garrison, "The Tender Technicians," 131–59.
30. Fobazi Ettarh, "Vocational Awe and Librarianship: The Lies We Tell Ourselves," *In the Library with the Lead Pipe* (October 18, 2017), <https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2018/vocational-awe/>.
31. Barbara B. Moran, Elisabeth Leonard, and Jessica Zellers, "Women Administrators in Academic Libraries: Three Decades of Change," *Library Trends* 58, no. 2 (2009): 215–28; Mickey Zemon and Alice Harrison Bahr, "Career and/or Children: Do Female Academic Librarians Pay a Price for Motherhood?" *College & Research Libraries* 66, no. 5 (2005): 394–405, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.66.5.394>; Alexandra Gallin-Parisi, "The Joy of Combining Librarianship and Motherhood," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 41, no. 6 (2015): 839–46, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.09.002>; Sharon Ladenson, "Paradigm Shift: Utilizing Critical Feminist Pedagogy in Library Instruction," *Critical Library Instruction: Theories and Methods* (2010): 105–12.
32. Barbara Wittkopf, "Recreating the Credit Course in an Online Environment: Issues and Concerns," *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (2003): 18–25; Yvonne Mery, Jill Newby, and Ke Peng, "Why One-Shot Information Literacy Sessions Are Not the Future of Instruction: A Case for Online Credit Courses," *College & Research Libraries* 73, no. 4 (2012): 369, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-271>.
33. Elizabeth Galoozis, "You Know How to Do This: Caring Service in Librarianship and Midwifery," in *Deconstructing Service in Libraries: Intersections of Identities and Expectations*, eds. Joanna Gadsby and Veronica Arellano Douglas (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books, LLC, 2020), 257 [accessed 9 February 2022, from ProQuest Ebook Central]; Shana Higgins, "Situating Service: Care and Equity in Academic Libraries," in *Deconstructing Service in Libraries: Intersections of Identities and Expectations* (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2020), 249.
34. Ann Ferguson, Rosemary Hennessy, and Mechthild Nagel, "Feminist Perspectives on Class and Work," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2021), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/feminism-class/>.
35. Johanna Brenner, *Women and the Politics of Class* (New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 2000); Lisa Slonowski, "Affective Labor, Resistance, and the Academic Librarian," *Library Trends* 64, no. 4 (2016): 645–66, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2016.0013>.
36. Ettarh, "Vocational Awe and Librarianship."
37. R. Butler and S.P.J. Von Wielligh, "Using Guest Lecturers to Address the Gap between Theory and Practice in Auditing Studies at a South African University: A Case Study," *Southern African Journal of Accountability and Auditing Research* 13, no. 1 (2012): 47–56, <https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC120955>.
38. Artman, Friscaro-Pawłowski, and Monge, "Not Just One Shot."
39. Kathleen Gallagher, "From Guest Lecturer to Assignment Consultant: Exploring a New Role for the Teaching Librarian," *LOEX Conference Proceedings 2007*, <https://commons.emich.edu/loexconf2007/31>; Nicole Pagowsky, "LibGuides: University of Arizona Libraries' Instruction Program: Integrating Instruction," <https://libguides.library.arizona.edu/c.php?g=463822&p=3170646> [accessed 25 February 2022].
40. Lars Christiansen, Mindy Stompler, and Lyn Thaxton, "A Report on Librarian-Faculty Relations from a Sociological Perspective," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 30, no. 2 (2004): 116–21, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2004.01.003>.
41. Ettarh, "Vocational Awe and Librarianship."
42. Elinor Cleghorn, *Unwell Women: A Journey Through Medicine and Myth in a Man-made World* (Hachette, UK: Dutton, 2021).
43. Evelyn Nakano Glenn, "Racial Ethnic Women's Labor: The Intersection of Race, Gender and Class Oppression," *Review of Radical Political Economics* 17, no. 3 (1985): 86–108, <https://doi.org/10.1177/048661348501700306>.
44. Cecilia Menjivar, "Skills of the 'Unskilled': Work and Mobility among Mexican Migrants," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39, no. 13 (2016): 2456–58; Zuzana Cepla and Helen Dempster, "There's No Such Thing as a 'Low'-Skill Worker," *Center for Global Development* (June 23, 2021), <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/theres-no-such-thing-low-skill-worker>.

45. Margarita Torre, "Stopgappers? The Occupational Trajectories of Men in Female-Dominated Occupations," *Work and Occupations* 45, no. 3 (2018): 283–312, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888418780433>; J. Andrew Forsman and Joan M. Barth, "The Effect of Occupational Gender Stereotypes on Men's Interest in Female-Dominated Occupations," *Sex Roles* 76, no. 7 (2017): 460–72, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0673-3>; Alison Pullen and Ruth Simpson, "Managing Difference in Feminized Work: Men, Otherness and Social Practice," *Human Relations* 62, no. 4 (2009): 561–87, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708101989>.

46. Kaetrena Davis Kendrick and Ione T. Damasco, "Low Morale in Ethnic and Racial Minority Academic Librarians: An Experiential Study," *Library Trends* 68, no. 2 (2019): 174–212, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2019.0036>.

47. Kendrick and Damasco, "Low Morale in Ethnic and Racial Minority Academic Librarians."

48. Chiung Hwang Chen, "Feminization of Asian (American) Men in the U.S. Mass Media: An Analysis of The Ballad of Little Jo," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 20, no. 2 (1996): 57–71, <https://doi.org/10.1177/019685999602000204>; Andrew Wong, "Bottoms Up: A Queer Asian Perspective on Service in Academic Librarianship," in *Deconstructing Service in Libraries: Intersections of Identities and Expectations*, eds. Joanna Gadsby and Veronica Arellano Douglas (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books, LLC, 2020), 35 [accessed 9 February 2022 from ProQuest Ebook Central].

49. Emy Takinami, 2016. "Feminized Asians and Masculinized Blacks: The Construction of Gendered Races in the United States" (UVM Honors College Senior Thesis, January 2016), <https://scholarworks.uvm.edu/hcol-theses/120>.

50. Madeline E. Cohen, "The Flipped Classroom as a Tool for Engaging Discipline Faculty in Collaboration: A Case Study in Library-Business Collaboration," *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 1 (2016): 5–23; Trena Napier et al., "A Collaborative, Trilateral Approach to Bridging the Information Literacy Gap in Student Writing," *College & Research Libraries* 79, no. 1 (2018): 120; Amy S. Van Epps and Megan R. Sapp Nelson, "One-Shot or Embedded? Assessing Different Delivery Timing for Information Resources Relevant to Assignments," *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 8, no. 1 (2013): 4–18.

51. Nicholson, "Being in Time," 145.

52. Ferguson, Hennessy, and Nagel, "Feminist Perspectives on Class and Work."

53. Moeller, "Insert Instruction Here"; Megan Browndorf and Maura Seale, "Service, Gender, and Liaison Librarianship," in *Deconstructing Service in Libraries: Intersections of Identities and Expectations* (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books, 2020), 11–34.

54. Shana Higgins, "Embracing the Feminization of Librarianship," *LIS Scholarship Archive* (2017): 84, <https://doi.org/10.31229/osf.io/q6zbx>; Craig M. Guild, "Social Reproduction Theory in the Academic Library: Understanding the Implications of Socially Reproductive Labor as Labor," *Public Services Quarterly* 15, no. 3 (2019): 263–71, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228959.2019.1629859>; Lisa Sloniowski, "Affective Labor, Resistance, and the Academic Librarian," *Library Trends* 64, no. 4 (2016): 645–66, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2016.0013>.

55. Keith A. Roberts and Karen A. Donahue, "Professing Professionalism: Bureaucratization and Deprofessionalization in the Academy," *Sociological Focus* 33, no. 4 (2000): 368.

56. Roberts and Donahue, "Professing Professionalism," 366.

57. Linda W. Braun, "Contract Concerns," *American Libraries* (November 1, 2019), <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2019/11/01/contract-concerns-library-unions/>; Andrea Baer, "Gently Stretching to Reach All Students: Inclusive Learning through Scaffolding and Flexible Pedagogy," *College & Research Libraries News* 82, no. 4 (2021): 182.

58. Lübke, Laura, Martin Pinqart, and Malte Schwinger. 2021. "The Role of Flexibility in the Realization of Inclusive Education." *Sustainability* 13 (8): 4452. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084452>.

59. Cardamone, Carie, and Heather Dwyer. 2021. "Balancing Flexibility and Rigor to Support Student Success," February. <https://soar.usi.edu/handle/20.500.12419/623>; Reynolds, Julie A., Victor Cai, Julia Choi, Sarah Faller, Meghan Hu, Arthi Kozhumam, Jonathan Schwartzman, and Ananya Vohra. 2020. "Teaching during a Pandemic: Using High-Impact Writing Assignments to Balance Rigor, Engagement, Flexibility, and Workload." *Ecology and Evolution* 10 (22): 12573–80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6776>.

60. Maria T. Accardi, *Feminist Pedagogy for Library Instruction* (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2010), <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/csun/detail.action?docID=3328244>.

61. The specific techniques to apply flexible pedagogy is out of the scope of this article. For more information, please refer to Andrea Baer, "Gently Stretching to Reach All Students: Inclusive Learning Through Scaffolding and Flexible Pedagogy," *College & Research Libraries News* 82, no. 4 (2021): 182; Ryerson University, *Flexible Learning Resources*, <https://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/learning-teaching/teaching-resources/teach-a-course/flexible-learning.pdf>.

62. Michael A. Germano, "Does Workplace Inflexibility Cost Libraries? Library Worklife," <https://ala-apa.org/newsletter/2010/03/28/does-workplace-inflexibility-cost-libraries/> [accessed 24 February 2022].

63. Anne Puolakanaho et al., "A Psychological Flexibility-Based Intervention for Burnout: A Randomized

Controlled Trial," *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science* 15 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2019.11.007>; Nina Nevanperä et al., "Psychological Flexibility, Occupational Burnout and Eating Behavior among Working Women," *Open Journal of Preventive Medicine* 3, no. 4 (2013): 355–61, <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpm.2013.34048>.

64. Zülbiye Kaçay, Nuri Berk Güngör, and Fikret Soyer, "The Mediating Role of Cognitive Flexibility in the Effect of Empathic Tendency on Teacher Professionalism," *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies* 8, no. 1 (2021): 124–34, <https://doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2021.8.1.167>.

65. Steve Burrell, "The CIO as Quantum Leader," *EDUCAUSE Review* (October 18, 2021), <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2021/10/the-cio-as-quantum-leader>.