A Survey of Media Facilities in Academic Libraries

PHYLLIS GERALDINE AHLSTED

Introduction

IN NOVEMBER 1979 New Jersey voters were asked on a bond issue referendum to provide Stockton State College with a new library addition. Anticipating an affirmative vote, library administrators encouraged staff members to participate in the overall expansion plans. Stockton's media center was targeted for extensive overhaul, and the media staff were charged with the responsibility of recommending design changes. To facilitate this task the staff searched for relevant literature using the ERIC database, *Library Literature*, standard bibliographies, and library design monographs. It soon became evident, however, that there had been virtually no research conducted on the place of media centers in academic libraries. In light of the pedagogical revolution in higher education involving the use of media and concomitant changes in libraries, this omission seemed even more remarkable.

Research therefore was undertaken to determine the state of media in other academic libraries. A survey was designed to study: (1) media collections and how they are arranged, accessed, and circulated; (2) staffing configurations; (3) space and funding allocations; and (4) other services offered within the media center. In choosing appropriate institutions for this study, the school's full-time equivalent student enrollment and the amount of media housed within the library determined each school's eligibility. The sample was selected from the 1980 edition of the *American Library Directory*.

Phyllis Geraldine Ahlsted is Coordinator, Media and Technology, Library-Media Services, Stockton State College, Pomona, New Jersey.

In 1980, questionnaires were mailed to 748 libraries. Despite defeat of the bond issue, research continued and by the end of 1982 a total of 363 usable questionnaires had been received, making a response rate of 49 percent. This was an adequate indicator of the state of media in academic libraries and with the help of staff and students the results were tabulated. The responses were organized into three categories and coded (see table 1). Since the main interest was in information concerning midrange schools—that is, schools with enrollments somewhere between 1001 and 8000 students—the majority of questionnaires went to those institutions. However, in order to give the survey a broader perspective, both larger and smaller schools were included within the sample. For the purpose of comparison, the data were eventually converted to percentages. (The survey is presented in its entirety in the appendix. Discussion and analysis of the data follow the same pattern as the survey.)

One defect of this survey is obvious—the data are now three to five years old. Pertinent subjects such as library automation, microcomputers, and the burgeoning video market have been either completely ignored or treated in a cursory fashion. Nevertheless, because academic libraries are plagued by the same ailment that has generally afflicted most institutions—namely, shrinking financial support—there have been relatively minor shifts in the emphasis or character of these institutions during the past few years. Thus, the information presented in this study remains useful and relevant to issues affecting media centers in academic libraries. It is hoped that the data offered here will provide a foundation for those planning for or evaluating the role of media in their academic library.[1]

Collection Composition and User Preferences

The heart of a media center housed within an academic library is its collections. Not only do these collections offer the academic community another information resource, but they are critical in the design of educational programs. Consequently, it is important to understand the composition of the average media center—that is, what formats compose what percentages of the total collection—and to compare these findings with user preferences.[2]

Our data indicate that the average media center in an academic library consists of 36 percent audio materials, 55 percent visual materials, and 9 percent audiovisual materials. In order of preference, patrons use 16mm, video, audiocassettes, phonorecords, filmstrip kits,

TABLE 1

SURVERY OF MEDIA HOLDINGS IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES:
ENROLLMENT, REGION AND CHRONOLOGY

Enrollment	*No. of responses*
0-1000	45
1001-3500	146
3501-5000	45
5001-8000	58
8001-15,000	53
15,001-25,000	15
Region	No. of responses
New England	32
Mid-Atlantic	71
South	81
Mid-West	100
West	79
Chronology (year founded)	*No. of Responses*
17th and 18th Centuries	6
1800-1850	33
1851-1900	144
1901-1940	96
1941-present	84

sound slide sets, single slides, overhead transparencies, filmstrips, 8mm, and audio reel-to-reel tape.

Although there is a discrepancy between the user's preference for audiocassettes and the much higher percentage of phonorecords making up the total audio collection (see table 2), the overall results are not surprising. Since the audiocassette and its accompanying playback equipment have been perfected, the reel-to-reel format has become almost solely a production tool. A large variety of educational material is now available for purchase on cassette tape, and it is no secret that many institutions transfer their more popular record holdings onto cassette for circulation purposes. Although transferring from one medium to another without permission represents an outright copyright violation, it is nonetheless practiced.

TABLE 2
AUDIO FORMATS

COLLECTIONS				
1. Audio reel-to-reel			9%	
2. Audiocassettes			24%	
3. Phonorecords			67%	
USER PREFERENCES:	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	
1. Audio reel-to-reel	5%	14%	81%	
2. Audiocassettes	59%	30%	11%	
3. Phonorecords	53%	29%	19%	

It is understandable that the bulk of media collections are in the visual format category (see table 3). While it is common for a collection to contain hundreds of overhead transparencies and thousands of single slides, it is unusual for it to have equally large collections of 16mm films or videocassettes.

TABLE 3
VISUAL FORMATS

COLLECTIONS			
1. 8mm films			2%
2. Filmstrip			9%
3. Overhead Transparencies			5%
4. Single Slides			84%
USER PREFERENCES	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
1. 8mm	6%	25%	69%
2. Filmstrip	19%	41%	40%
3. Overhead Transparencies	23%	31%	46%
4. Single Slides	31%	41%	28%

Slides are an old and popular medium. Given their broad applicability and the ease with which they are both purchased and produced, it is no wonder slides are the most preferred of the strictly visual media. The drawback to a collection of single slides is its management. Certainly a collection can grow quickly, but what was once a simple and inexpensive format eventually becomes a complex and expensive resource needing special handling and maintenance.

Statistics from the survey show that the 8mm format is rarely collected or used. This is probably due to the limited nature of the 8mm film itself—it is brief, without sound, and difficult to employ in an instructional context. Patrons seem to like overhead transparencies more than the limited holdings of most collections would suggest. Filmstrips, on the other hand, are still used, but their popularity appears to be diminishing. This may be because users prefer either single slides, filmstrip kits, or sound slide sets, and not an in-between medium.

According to the survey, 16mm film is the preferred format, with video placing second (see table 4). Videotape does have its shortcomings. Some productions, such as certain art films, do not hold up well on videotapes, and viewing by large audiences is a problem without special equipment. Still, video may have surpassed 16mm as the most preferred format. This is due in large part to: (1) the increased educational offerings on three-quarter inch videotape, (2) the one-half inch video-tape explosion, (3) the often dramatic price differences between film and video formats, and (4) the improvement of and greater user familiarity with video playback equipment. The data indicate that patrons prefer those formats which are self-contained. This is pertinent when considering media usage in a classroom context. If an instructor has to struggle with the material, it can hardly enhance the educational process. Thus a fundamental responsibility of the academic media center is to collect materials which serve the specific needs of faculty and students in higher education. This emphasis will help to transform the image of the media center from that of an entertainment facility to that of an important and legitimate pedagogical resource.

TABLE 4
AUDIOVISUAL FORMATS

COLLECTIONS			
1. 16mm			37%
2. Video			14%
3. Filmstrip kits			27%
4. Sound slide sets			22%
USER PREFERENCES	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
1. 16mm	69%	21%	10%
2. Video	60%	25%	15%
3. Filmstrip kits	38%	43%	19%
4. Sound slide sets	36%	45%	19%

General Conclusions

1. Phonorecords and audiocassettes are popular items and should remain in media collections. It is important to keep in mind that these items are essential not only because they support a music curriculum, but because they are an integral part of faculty and student life.
2. Reel-to-reel acquisitions should be phased out.
3. Filmstrip collections and 8mm films should remain minimal unless there are specific requests for them.
4. Overhead transparencies need more attention.
5. Slides should be collected. Their broad applicability and frequent use in faculty and student productions make them quite useful.
6. Filmstrip kits and sound slide sets are good investments, but the main acquisitions efforts should be in the area of 16mm and video formats.

Arrangement of the Collection

The question on arrangement of the collection was designed to determine the patterns in physical arrangement and storage of media materials. Of the respondents, academic libraries devote about 10 percent of their square footage to media. This allotment seems to shrink as enrollments increase—a phenomenon that is easily explained. First, if a library is physically large, 10 percent could represent an entire floor or building, while in a smaller library, 10 percent might mean one room. Second, a larger institution is less likely to have a central facility, and might have its media resources scattered throughout the campus.

Shelving preference is clear—77 percent of the responding libraries shelve by media format, 20 percent shelve by call number, and 3 percent interfile their collection. This is an obvious response to the special shelving requirements media materials demand. It is nearly impossible to shelve collections of size and variety by call number. Each format has its own distinct shape and there is often a difference in size within the format itself. One can only conclude, therefore, that shelving by call number implies a small collection.

Large collections of slides are also the most difficult to control. A picture may be worth a thousand words, but it is also possible to use some pictures in at least a thousand ways. Because of this extraordinary range of choices—and implicitly, the substantial indexing or cataloging task—libraries have for years been reluctant to develop substantial slide resources. Consequently, the potential impact of slide collections

is often weakened by compartmentalization—that is, each area jealously protects its holdings at the expense of other areas which might find the slides useful.

Overall, 40 percent of the respondents have separate slide collections while 60 percent do not. The statistics point to a correlation between enrollment and centralization, since smaller academic libraries tend to have separate slide collections. This is probably due to the fact that in larger institutions, departments often control their own slide collections. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that only the departments are at fault. By and large, most libraries are hesitant to take on the responsibility for acquiring and maintaining a general slide collection.

Access to the Collection

The survey question of access seeks to determine if collections have open or closed stacks, and how these configurations affect patrons and staff. Access to media collections can be a troublesome issue in an academic library. In an environment where intellectual vitality is paramount, "browsing" is an important activity for student and scholar alike. Some would even argue that it is an integral part of the process which produces creative thought and insight. Yet scanning a shelf filled with plastic video cases or metal film cans (whose titles often belie their contents) is hardly as rewarding as browsing among print collections.

Furthermore, open collections often produce anxiety among media staff responsible for collection control. Patrons move materials from one place to another making it difficult to run an efficient operation— particularly if the media collections are linked to a classroom delivery service. There is always the fear of theft especially in the video format. This becomes increasingly worrisome as the one-half inch video format, which is compatible with home videocassette recorders, makes its way onto library shelves.

Still, patrons seem to need and want the browsing option and, as the survey shows, the respondents have for the most part satisfied this demand. Although open access to media is generally not useful, it will probably continue for a time—a source of relief to those patrons frustrated by the lack of adequate cataloging. A critical need here is a more sophisticated and thorough approach to both subject heading assignment and annotations. Once that is accomplished open collections will probably become obsolete.

Circulation

While media materials rarely have restricted circulation within the confines of the library, circulation outside of the controlled library environment poses some major problems. Video and 16mm film formats are expensive, phonorecords are easily harmed, and filmstrips and slides are fragile. Most media are dependent upon specialized equipment which, if not properly maintained, can cause serious damage to the materials. Despite these limitations, 57 percent of the institutions surveyed circulate media outside of the library; even more, 71 percent, allow community groups to borrow media. Based on the survey data, it appears that if a library allows its media to circulate outside of the library, then it permits all of its media to circulate regardless of format. This is rather curious since it would seem logical that the more expensive and fragile items would be governed by restrictive policies.

Evidently, automated circulation systems for media collections have not been a high priority in the academic library, because 91 percent of the collections in the survey are manually operated and only 9 percent attempt automation. This is partly the result of the general bias which has traditionally faced media. When machine conversion projects were begun, monographic collections became the priority. Only recently have retrospective conversion projects for media been implemented. It is interesting to note that the state library directors involved in the New Jersey CL Systems Incorporated (CLSI) automation project recommended that media receive a secondary status for input into the system. Until this bias is overcome and librarians come to regard audiovisual media as important sources of information in their own right, the prospects for the automation of access to media materials remain unclear. The final goal of automation should be to improve access and service, and that goal should include all information resources.

Collection Development

There is little discussion in the professional literature that deals specifically with collection development as it pertains to the audiovisual field. Yet the data in this survey reveal that 42 percent of the responding institutions have compiled collection development policies. Because few precedents exist in this area, we found this percentage rather surprising. It might be legitimate to assume, therefore, that many of these policies are informal in nature and are characterized by inexplicit guidelines.[4]

Faculty involvement is clearly a prerequisite for any intelligent approach to media collection development since faculty will often discover references to media materials through their own professional journals and contacts. These materials, which sometimes go unnoticed by media reviewing tools, can be ordered for evaluation and possible purchase. The survey results suggest that this practice is a common one—faculty and staff have considerable recommending power, and students also seem to be well represented in the process.

Previewing media materials is another essential part of any media selection process, and previewing should be the rule rather than the exception. The committee approach to selection is used by 75 percent of the libraries surveyed. This approach both helps to justify the cost of the more expensive items and involves the user. As Donald Ely argues in "Technology à la Carte," "educational technology is most successful when those who will ultimately use and benefit from it are involved in the adoption process."[5]

Locating and selecting media materials is not an easy task to accomplish. Not only is there no single comprehensive listing of media materials, but the specific lists and guides which are available are often not arranged by format and rarely by subject. As Richard K. Gardner points out in *Library Collections: Their Origin, Selection, and Development,* there are few "good inclusive guides to films or other visual materials that offer selective lists of recommended works. Most existing guides are merely inclusive listings of all that is available."[6]

Distributors', producers', and publishers' catalogs are by far the most popular reference tools among those who responded to the survey. Library and media periodicals seem to be used about equally and the NICEM indexes come close to having a "standard" status. Film and video catalogs are also regularly consulted and the *Schwann Record and Tape Guide* is the predominant source for musical selection. Some of the most regularly used review sources include *Previews, Choice, Booklist, Media and Methods, Video Source Book,* and *Educational Film Locator.*

While all of these are of some value, there are few truly comprehensive sources for review of all media types. This, coupled with the fact that many reviews recommend media items for a college audience which are in fact more appropriate for elementary or secondary schools, makes the selection of media materials a cumbersome process.

No discussion of collection development can be complete without some mention of budgetary considerations. The figures are telling. Only 9 percent of library budgets are earmarked for media and a staggering 68 percent of the libraries do not have other institutional funds to

supplement their collections. This is a fatal funding formula. If a media center is located within an academic library and has no source of revenue outside of the library budget, it will probably be the first to be cut in a money crunch. A better arrangement would be to establish separate budgets that do not compete with one another and which reflect the distinctive nature of the materials themselves.

Staffing

Working within an academic library can be awkward and irritating for media personnel. If they happen to be library trained, they may be viewed suspiciously by the media staff. Conversely, if they are media trained, they sometimes are viewed disdainfully by the library staff. Staffing then is a question of delicate balance between the media center and its academic library parent.

The average media center in the survey is staffed with 12 percent professional employees, 22 percent support staff, and 66 percent student workers. Dependence on staff support and student aid is common in academic libraries, but major problems can arise when media personnel are recruited from among library trained employees.

In the library complex, media personnel interact with patrons in many unique ways. Since subject access often does not match user requirements, patrons depend on the media staff's recommendations. The staff, then, should be familiar with the contents of the materials in order to provide reference services. In addition to this knowledge, media personnel need to have some mechanical aptitude because they work constantly with media equipment. Thus if media are to play an active role in the curriculum, the attendant staff must be willing to combine content knowledge and mechanical skills—a blend different from other areas of the library.

In the professional ranks, 42 percent of media center personnel have library titles and 58 percent have media titles. The survey shows that the most desirable credential is an MLS with media training, but when it comes to the actual hiring, the media specialist is preferred. Perhaps as media become more acceptable in the academic library, a combination of library and media training will become the standard educational requirement for media personnel.

Among many things, personality stereotyping accounts for some of these staffing problems. It is generally agreed that print and nonprint folk don't mix. The bias against the superficiality of nonprint is as real as the bias against the "dull" book world. Librarians as a group are

viewed as introspective while media people are perceived as tempera-
mental and a little out of control.

Although there may be an element of truth hidden within each of
these stereotypes, the prejudices which result must be overcome if librar-
ies are to meet the future demands of society. Librarians should be
willing to accept media as an information source on a par with mono-
graphs, and media people should recognize the crucial role of librarian-
ship in dealing with the information explosion.

Bibliographic Control

Bibliographic control of media simply means providing specific
access points to materials in order to answer a user's inquiry. Because of
media's special characteristics, bibliographic control has been largely
overlooked until recently.

The fact that 61 percent of the media collections in the survey are
cataloged by technical services staff and 36 percent are cataloged by
media staff is revealing. On the one hand, it implies some acceptance on
the part of the library community for media materials as an information
source since cataloging, whether print or nonprint, is done centrally.
However, it may also indicate that media personnel are skeptical of
traditional cataloging practices as they are applied to media materials.
There is some justification for this view. First, most media people feel
that they are probably better qualified to catalog media because they
have first-hand experience both with the content of the materials and
the client's needs. Second, media materials require more original
cataloging—a situation which makes familiarity with the materials
themselves crucial. Finally, some technical services staff are uncomfort-
able cataloging media, amd media are often relegated to a low-priority
status.

The question dealing with descriptive cataloging (see appendix,
sect. VIII, no. 2) might have been better designed, because the options
are not mutually exclusive. For instance, "computer-based" cataloging
can be both AACR and in-house. Nonetheless, connections between the
technical services staff and AACR descriptive cataloging, and between
media staff and in-house systems, are apparent. Technical services staff
are usually trained to employ standardized practices for bibliographic
description. Media staff for the most part are not trained catalogers,
though they probably have a better sense than catalogers of access points
for media. The unfortunate result of this situation, however, is that
media continues to be cataloged by different standards—a condition
which leaves everyone confused.

Another interesting correlation can be found between classification and access. Of the libraries responding, 55 percent use either LC or Dewey, and over 50 percent of the collections provide open access. This is not a coincidence. It is well established that classification enhances browsing by allowing for a more sophisticated storage and retrieval system.

OCLC is a vital cataloging tool for the general academic library because it provides the library with a central database. It is especially useful for the media cataloger since it promotes consistency and standardization. Another advantage of OCLC is its emphasis on keeping cataloging practices current. For instance, OCLC was the first to implement the Machine Readable Data File in October 1984.[7] It is consequently not surprising that 70 percent of the responding institutions use OCLC.

Subject indexing is very important to the user and exceedingly challenging for the media cataloger. Traditional cataloging techniques tend toward the specific, but the needs of media's clientele tend to be general. This paradox is not easily solved. How does the cataloger identify the contents of a film in a precise manner and satisfy the user's need for generalization at the same time? It is impractical to expect every film dealing with psychology to be listed under that heading. It is equally unsatisfactory to list a film on Freud under his name but not under psychology. When cataloging comes to terms with media's broad applicability, access will be greatly improved and media materials will be available to a more diverse educational audience.

As far as access points are concerned, the need for title and subject access is obvious. With media, these descriptors are more likely to be used than author access. It is rare for a patron to ask to see a list of all of the films made, for example, by Perry Miller Adado, or all of the videos produced by McGraw-Hill. The user may, however, need to see titles and annotations for each part of Kenneth Clark's "Civilisation" series.

Other Media

Thus far this study has concentrated on media collections themselves. But if a collection is to achieve a status beyond that of a materials repository, there should be some relationship to other types of media services.

In recent years, academic libraries have become increasingly interested in integrating media centers, especially as microcomputers and their accompanying software become a high priority. The survey data illustrate this trend. In fact, we were surprised to discover that support media services are not as insignificant as expected.

When a library commits itself to a general collection of media software it is also stating that the collection is to be used by the general patron. Therefore, it needs to make available and maintain viewing facilities. If it were otherwise, individual departments would keep their media materials for classroom use, and there would be no need for either a previewing facility or a carrel area.

Delivery services—which require considerable support staff and a certain level of technical expertise—can be costly operations. In the survey, 68 percent of the libraries have equipment delivery services and 50 percent have equipment repair services. Still, it is safe to assume that if there are technicians on the staff to help run the equipment the staff is also involved with repair.

The relatively high percentage (60 percent) of production services offered within the academic library was most surprising. We believe this figure may be misleading since the question does not specify the level of service. There is a substantial difference between offering service for video production and providing for slide duplication. It seems safe to infer that libraries generally do not support a full range of production services, but probably maintain some of the more modest ones.

It is understandable that a darkroom is least likely (33 percent) to be located in the academic library. Darkrooms are costly in terms of staff and maintenance and have stringent design requirements governing physical layout. This is an unfortunate situation. Experience at Stockton has shown that if a library does operate a darkroom, it is widely used and appreciated.

Consideration of the relationship of media materials to playback equipment is essential (see appendix, sect. X), for it is this interdependence which characterizes the media center. Most media are machine-dependent. To strike a balance between materials and equipment is one of the hardest tasks facing administrators. As Richard E. Moore points out in an article *Audiovisual Instruction:* "Nonbook media folk have been more concerned with rapidly changing hardware, its acquisition and maintenance, rather than the application of the equipment to instruction."[8]

Founded during an era when technology was seen as a panacea for educational ills, many libraries with media holdings have emphasized the need to acquire new hardware. However, it is important not to purchase new hardware before educational materials for that hardware are available, because playback equipment is often more advanced than the educational materials available for use on that equipment. Technology, despite its seductive quality, can too often lead to the tacit assumption that media equipment is more important than media materials.

American society is obsessed with gadgetry, and educational technology is no exception to that predilection.

Conclusion

It is important to remember that percentages can be misleading. Even though the data identify the contents of an average media center among the responding academic libraries, in reality no such typical configuration exists. Thus these averages are descriptive, not normative. They are meant to provide a reference point for planning and should not be viewed as either a standard or a recommendation. Still the data presented here have an intrinsic interest and they suggest some general conclusions.

This survey indicates that 80 percent of the respondents perceive the demand for media as increasing. An incongruity here is that only 28 percent of the respondents were at the time seeking grants to maintain their media services. Yet when a library chooses to include media materials among its holdings, it should also recognize that media are not peripheral to a library's financial planning. If media materials are perceived as equal to but different from printed materials, appropriate funding formulas need to be devised to guarantee the continued strength of the media center. Additional funding sources—that is, sources outside of the regular library budget—must be sought. Should this not be done as a matter of course, competition between print and nonprint for library funds will eventually render the media center ineffective.

The survey data also indicate that media collections are tied closely to the way an institution's curriculum evolves. A school of music, quite naturally, might have a preponderance of records and perhaps few, if any, slides. Nevertheless, while curricular demands help shape the character of each media collection, it is important to compare the frequencies with which each format appears in the average collection. Format preference, like subject emphasis, remains a major factor in determining the character of a media collection. According to the survey, respondents' preferences from most to least preferred were as follows:

1. audiocassettes
2. phonorecords
3. film strips
4. 16mm films
5. single slides

6. videocassettes
7. filmstrip kits
8. audiotape reel-to-reels
9. 8mm films
10. overhead transparencies
11. sound/slide sets

Other interesting bits of information were gleaned from the survey data, among them:

—phonorecords are present in most collections surveyed and are particularly prevalent in older schools. This might be explained by the affordability and familiarity of sound technology;

—among the responding libraries, there is a trend that 16mm film collections increase with enrollment. Aside from the obvious fact that larger institutions have larger resources, 16mm film collections have become traditional in many libraries;

—among the libraries surveyed, institutions founded between 1851 and 1900 generally have the best collections—that is, collections which include well-rounded representations in all formats;

—among the responding libraries, slide collections that are separated from other software collections contain an average of 12,000 single slides;

—among schools responding to the survey, those founded between 1901 and 1940 have the most square footage devoted to media and the largest percentage of open collections;

—among academic libraries returning the survey, larger schools are less likely to have browsable collections. Security and preservation considerations probably explain this situation;

—among the responding libraries, larger and newer schools tend to automate and schools that automate generally impose fine policies;

—among the libraries surveyed, the relationship between staffing and collections reveals a definite trend toward specialization according to function. For the most part, librarians are in charge of collection development while media personnel handle circulation;

—among those responding, schools in New England have an especially active approach to writing grants compared to other regions of the country.

Although, taken as a whole, the results of this survey offer few surprises, they do provide confirmation for many hitherto undocumented assumptions about media collections. At the same time, the statistics can be interpreted in two quite different ways—either as a

justification for removing media entirely from the academic library, or as evidence that media should form an integral part of a library's holdings.

I feel that the incorporation of media within an academic library is the best alternative. Few would today reject the notion that media can become an effective part of the teaching and learning process. Indeed, if academic libraries function best when they form a natural extension of the classroom, media can just as naturally lay claim to a place in the library. But media's legitimacy extends beyond routine classroom applications. Perhaps its early history as a teaching aid used almost exclusively in elementary and secondary schools has made us less appreciative of its potential for serious research. Happily, that attitude is beginning to change as colleges and universities give closer attention to the value of media materials as scholarly resources. In the end, both scholars and librarians have much to gain by encouraging this development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

References

1. For a different statistical approach to the subject of media in higher education, the reader should consult the DEMM Task Force Report. See Albright, Michael J., chair. "The Status of Media Centers in Higher Education: DEMM Task Force Report." *Media Management Journal* 1(Spring 1984):4-18.

2. Initially, the percentage of each format was calculated separately. As we progressed, we realized that the statistics were skewed, because the 16mm film and video formats represented less than 1 percent of the total collection. This is clearly a problem since it is commonplace for libraries to collect more of those items which are considerably less costly. Thus a straightforward numerical comparison is inappropriate. To correct

this bias, the data were grouped into three categories: (1) strictly audio formats, (2) strictly visual formats, and (3) audiovisual formats. User preferences were analyzed according to (H) high, (M) medium, and (L) low ratings.

3. As A.L. Wright has noted: "slide programs in the hands of skilled teachers are not only useful in themselves, but also stimulate creative impulses in others." See Wright, A.L. "A Slide Library That Grew Gloriously Out of Hand." *Audio-Visual Instruction* 24(Oct. 1979):31.

4. Richard Gardner concludes: "When all is said and done, the fact remains that many libraries, particularly large ones, have never adopted a collection development policy." See Gardner, Richard K. *Library Collections: Their Origin, Selection and Development.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981, p. 229.

5. Ely, Donald P. "Technology á la Carte." *Instructional Innovator* 25(Jan. 1980):19.

6. Gardner, *Library Collections*, p. 167.

7. Richard Green, OCLC Section Manager for Online Data Quality Control, to Phyllis Ahlsted, personal communication, 16 Sept. 1985.

8. Moore, Richard E. "Library Management of Media Center." *Audio-Visual Instruction* 24(Feb. 1979):48.

APPENDIX

I. Which of the following formats do you hold in your media materials Collection and what is the number of holdings in each format?

Avg. No.	%		Avg. No.	%	
329	3%	Audiotape, reel to reel	269	3%	Filmstrip kits with
924	8%	Audiotape, cassette			audiocassette or phonorecord
89	1%	8mm filmloops	334	3%	Overhead transparencies
398	4%	16mm films	5275	48%	Slides
135	1%	Videotapes	226	2%	Sound/slide programs
475	4%	Filmstrips	2565	23%	Phonorecords

II. Please indicate user preference of the formats:

High	Medium	Low	
5%	14%	81%	Audiotape, reel to reel
59%	30%	11%	Audiotape, cassette
6%	25%	69%	8mm filmloops
69%	21%	10%	16mm films
60%	25%	15%	Videotapes
19%	41%	40%	Filmstrips
38%	43%	19%	Filmstrip kits with audiocassette or phonorecord
23%	31%	46%	Overhead transparencies
31%	41%	28%	Slides
36%	45%	19%	Sound/slide programs
53%	29%	19%	Phonorecords

III. Arrangement of collection:

1. What percentage of library square footage is devoted to media?   10%

2. Are your media materials

   20%   shelved by call numbers (all formats together)?

   77%   shelved by format, then call number?

   3%   interfiled with book collection?

3. Is your slide collection, if you have one, in a separate area?   40% Yes   60% No

---

IV. Access to Collection:

For the purpose of these few questions, "open collection" shall be defined as a collection that may be browsed, and "closed" as one in which browsing is restricted.

Is your collection (based on the previous statement)

	Open to:		Closed to:
	51% Students		49% Students
	65% Faculty		35% Faculty
	65% Staff		35% Staff

V. Circulation:

1. On the following list, please check the formats which circulate outside of the library or off campus:

55%	Audiotape, reel to reel	49%	Overhead transparencies
65%	Audiotape, cassette	58%	Slides
50%	8mm filmloops	54%	Sound/slide programs
55%	16mm films	61%	Phonorecords
51%	Videotapes		
65%	Filmstrips		
64%	Filmstrip kits w/audiocassette or phonorecord		

2. Are your materials ever made available to community groups?   71% Yes   29% No

3. Which of the following describes your media materials circulation system?   91% Manual   9% Automated

4. Do you have fines for overdue materials?   54% Yes   46% No

5. Do you bill for lost or damaged materials?   85% Yes   15% No

VI.   Collection Development:

1. Does your library have a written collection development policy for media materials?   42% Yes   58% No

2. Which staff member is in charge of media collection development?   56% Library   44% Media

3. Do you have a preview/review committee for media materials?   75% Yes   25% No

4. Please check applicable: 96% Faculty   64% Students   79% Staff
   are able to recommend media materials purchases.

5. Which reference tools do you regularly use in selecting media materials? Please list:
   Distributor's, Publisher's, Producer's Catalogs, Library & Media Catalogs, Schwann Record & Tape Guide,
   NICEM Indexes, Previews, Choice, Booklist, Media and Methods, Video Source Book,
   Educational Film Locator

6. Percentage of library budget devoted to media services   9%

7. Do you have other institutional funds, aside from library budget, available for media material purchases?
   32% Yes   68% No

VII.   Staffing:

1. Please fill in the number of staff in your media area:
   12% Professionals   22% Support   66% Student Workers

2. What is the title(s) of the professional staff?   42% Library   58% Media

VIII.   Bibliographic Control:

1. Who catalogs your materials?
   61% Technical services staff   36% Media services staff   3% Outside vendor

2. Is your collection descriptively cataloged?
   17% AACR I   42% AACR II   23% In-house generated   18% Computer-based

3. Is your collection classified?   37% LC   18% Dewey   27% Accession number   18% Unique number

4. Do you utilize OCLC in cataloging your media materials?   70% Yes   30% No

5. Can your media materials be accessed by: (check all applicable)
   82% Author?   90% Subject?   92% Title?   64% Series?   73% Shelf list?

IX.   Please check those services you offer, in addition to providing media materials:
   60% In-house production of audio, video, visual, graphic materials
   33% Darkroom facilities
   82% Previewing facilities
   68% Audiovisual equipment delivery
   50% Audiovisual equipment maintenance and repair
   80% Carrel area

X.   Media Equipment:

1. Do you have a circulating pool of equipment?   71% Yes   29% No

2. If yes:
   Does the library deliver and pick up this equipment?   63% Yes   37% No
   Dos the user pick up and return the equipment?   89% Yes   11% No

3. Who is eligible to use circulating pool? Please check:
   68% Faculty   61% Staff   52% Student   14% Other

4. Is there any charge for use of this equipment?   11% Yes   89% No

XI.   Conclusion:

Do you perceive the demand for media materials: 80% Increasing?   1% Decreasing?   19% Steady state?

If you perceive an increasing or steady state, are you involved in any grant proposal preparation to supplement
your existing library budget?   28% Yes   72% No

If yes, could you specify the grant source?   48% Federal   22% State   7% School   23% Other

This Page Intentionally Left Blank