Chapter 8
SURVEY ANALYSIS

Introduction

To further the purposes of Project 2000 a questionnaire survey of the theological libraries of North America was conducted. The questionnaire was mailed to head librarians of the accredited and associate members of ATS—187 discrete libraries.90 Responses were received from 141 libraries in time for tabulation. Subsequently, another seven replies were received. Thus, the effective return rate was a commendable 75.4 percent and the overall return was 79.1 percent. This surely was due, in some measure, to the wide support Project 2000 has enjoyed among ATS/ATLA libraries.

The questionnaire was designed to provide historical, operating, financial, and planning information about the libraries. Since these libraries report annual statistics to both the ATS and the ATLA and this information was not requested again.91 Specifically, the survey sought information that might prove useful in determining trends and tendencies within the libraries and provide a basis for planning and development. No attempt was made to analyze the responses by groupings such as the size or denomination of the school, although such analyses could be done. A tabulated copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A. The following discussion analyzes the survey results which have not been discussed elsewhere in this report.

Bibliographic Systems and Computers

The Library of Congress Classification (LC) now is the overwhelming choice of the theological libraries (74%). Fifty-six of the 61 libraries that have changed classification system in the past decade have adopted the LC system and seven of the nine schools

90 The ATLA institutional membership includes some schools which do not offer degree work in divinity at the post baccalaureate level. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used for all calculations.

91 These statistics appear annually in the Summary of Proceedings of the ATLA and in the Factbook published by ATS.
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that anticipate such a change in the next 10 years also will adopt the LC System. Although the schools were not asked reasons for their preference for the LC system, yet two facts about library classification stand out sharply.

First, a majority of theological libraries has not preferred, traditionally or by virtue of a recent change, a classification system designed precisely for theological collections, the Union Theological Seminary Classification. The classification system is at the very heart of a library and most theological libraries are now using and are likely to continue using a general system whose chief merit seems to be its otherwise widespread usage and its suitability for very large research collections.

Second, both the libraries that use the LC system and the 26 libraries (33%) that use the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) specialized theological library classification are using systems produced by large bibliographic services which may not be altogether attentive to the needs of small special constituencies. Stated positively, to effect special considerations from either the LC or the DDC systems, the theological libraries will need to marshal their needs carefully, present them forcefully, and be prepared to accept the compromises and accommodations which generally characterize large systems.

Of greater moment than classification is the decided movement towards computer assisted cataloguing that has been taking place in the theological libraries no less than in other academic libraries. Ninety-two seminary libraries are now members of a bibliographic utility; 15 anticipate joining a utility or network within five years, and another 10 schools anticipate joining within a decade. OCLC (Online Computer Library Center, formerly the Ohio College Library Center) is and will remain the utility servicing the majority of theological libraries. UTLAS (University of Toronto Library Automated Services) may have eight members, and RLIN (Research Library Information Network), three or four. Thus, even more than is the case with library classification, the theological libraries have cast their lot with large and complex bibliographic utilities. Our libraries will have to accept the products and services of these utilities or find effective ways to modify them. It would appear urgent that the OCLC members take immediate steps to
form a theological library users group; this is a development there is reason to believe OCLC would welcome.

Cataloguing is the primary product acquired from the bibliographic utilities. Inter-library lending also is heavily used with 58 percent of the schools reporting such activity. Twenty percent of utility members use the services of the utility for data base searching, but other services such as serials control, acquisitions, and circulation control are not used significantly.

The format and more significantly the nature of library catalogues are changing in step with the electronic technologies. Most libraries still have card catalogues and will have them for years to come, but already eight schools have broken with this practice and have introduced computer produced catalogues in a non-card format. Thirty-three libraries are supplementing their card catalogues with other computer produced formats. Of these, twenty-four schools have introduced a computer output microform (COM) catalogue, nine schools have on-line computer catalogues, and one library has a computer produced book catalogue. The on-line catalogue will increase in popularity as 23 schools plan to introduce it within five years and another 38 schools within 10 years. It appears that the COM catalogue will be less used, although 20 schools will use it within five years. Furthermore, 29

---

92 This assessment is based on conversations the Project Associate has had with officers of OCLC, Inc.
93 There is a curious anomaly in this regard. While computer assisted inter-library lending activity is relatively high, historically very few theological libraries reported their collection holdings to the National Union Catalog (38%) or the Union List of Serials (14%). This past inactivity is most regrettable and probably has been irresponsible. On the other hand, and much more positively, 70 percent of the libraries are now reporting their holdings to some other union catalog. This more recent activity has been greatly assisted by data manipulation by the computer based bibliographic utilities. Seventy-one of the 93 schools (76%) now participating in union catalogues are members of a bibliographic utility.
94 Many of these are recent OCLC services and we may expect their use in theological libraries to expand.
95 Nineteen of these libraries also plan to install an on-line catalogue within the decade.
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Schools are converting catalogue records to a machine readable format comprehensively and another 17 schools are doing such conversion less than comprehensively.

While the changing formats of library catalogues will bring both elements of uncertainty and greater effectiveness to library service, these formats themselves probably are not as important as the flexibility offered by computer produced catalogues. Computer catalogues are accessible in remote locations and these catalogues may be available to scholars of other institutions. Search strategies based on Boolean logic are possible and searches integrating both book files and periodical literature will be available.

Microcomputers also are making their presence felt in the theological libraries although not to the extent one might expect. Table 4 shows the present and anticipated use of micro-computers in the libraries. One might have expected that schools that are not members of bibliographic utilities might rely more heavily on micro-computers, but this is not the case. Apparently schools that have committed themselves to the electronic technologies are using these technologies in several ways and through several machines. The anticipated growth in the use of micro-computers is substantial and may be on the order of 255 percent over the next five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Using Now</th>
<th>Use Within Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cataloguing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-library lending</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book fund accounting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General accounting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data base searching</td>
<td>5 N = 47</td>
<td>31 (26%) N = 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Collections

Seventy-nine libraries reported that they have special collections "of national prominence." Fifty (64%) of these libraries hold the archives of their institution and 25 (33%) also hold the archives of some other organization(s). Respondents were asked to identify the topics or other characteristics around which these special collection have been developed. These characteristics were reflected in two ways. Some collections were identified in terms of denominational or ecclesiastical traditions. In other cases the collections were identified as documenting specific topics. Table 5 shows both the denominational and the topical cast of the collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditions/Orders</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anglo-Catholicism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bibles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>12 (15%)</td>
<td>William Blake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counter Reformation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples/Campbellite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dutch/American Imprints</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Francis de Sales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal/Anglican</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hymnody</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical United Br.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Judaica</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthcran</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryknoll Frs./Srs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mercerburg Theology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist/Wesleyan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Religions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Covenant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pietism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Polish/American Imprints</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Puerto Rican Protestants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reformation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Semitica</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multiple topics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collections named for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian/Universalist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>donors without</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>topical designation</td>
<td>17 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>17 (22%)</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>34 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 79

96 Question 25.
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Respondents also were asked to indicate if these collections pertain to specific chronological eras and if they include materials in special formats. This was an attempt to identify manuscript material in particular. The results of these analyses, however, are less conclusive than the topical analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century of Focus</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Format of Material</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early Printed Books</td>
<td>15 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeenth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early Periodicals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
<td>26 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteenth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twentieth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>26 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>11  (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>52  (66%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 78

Twenty-seven percent of these special collections are not being developed currently and another 38 (48%) of the collections receive less than 6 percent of the acquisitions budgets for current support. While some special collections are being cultivated with unusual care, special collection development apparently has lagged behind general theological library development. Yet a much more thorough analysis of this problem must be conducted before substantial conclusions may be reached in this area.

Budget Trends and Planning

The survey reflects a general budgetary picture of surprising constancy.\(^{97}\) Sixty-four percent of the schools have been able to maintain book funds at least at the rate of inflation over the past five years, and another 20 percent actually have increased their book funds over the rate of inflation. The report concerning staff is slightly less stable. Fifty-three percent of the schools have main-

\(^{97}\) See Carroll, 68, and also Fletcher, 45-58.
tained staff levels over the past five years, while 23 percent have increased staff and 23 percent have decreased staff. Some of the decrease in staff may be due indirectly to budgetary constraints.

The libraries anticipate much the same budgetary situation over the next five years. Sixty-four percent expect steady support for book funds and 69 percent expect staff size to remain constant. Twenty percent expect an increase over the rate of inflation for book funds, and 24 percent expect to add new staff members. Schools that have experienced decline over the past five years anticipate further decline and schools which have experienced a steady state equaling inflation for the past five years do not expect their budgets to grow more or shrink less than this. The only exception to this observation is that about half of the schools which have experienced a decline in their book funds over the past five years now expect this decline to level off and expect that book funds will hold their own against inflation for the next five years.

Most schools do not expect staff reductions to continue. Only five schools report staff reduction in the past five years and anticipate further staff reductions in the next five years. Cooperative programs and particularly the growing use of electronic technologies may have lessened the need for staff members in some libraries; thus the past five years may have been a period of exceptional adjustment in staff which is not likely to be repeated soon. In the case of computer systems, however, overall costs are not likely to be reduced. Any cost reduction based on fewer staff members occasioned by the use of these systems will be offset by the expense of the systems and the equipment they require.

These data are of course benign. Of more interest and importance is how libraries have responded to their budgetary constraints. In most cases when budgets for book funds have increased, the general collections have been the beneficiary. No one area, e.g., special collections, preservation, or foreign acquisitions, received disproportionate attention. Libraries that have experienced decline in their book funds responded the same way, a general decrease in acquisitions in all fields. Special collections, binding, and preservation expenses were not singled out for unusual reduction. Only periodical subscriptions and serial standing orders were so identified. These orders represent fixed charges in a
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library budget and any serious adjustment to a library book budget must alter the fixed charges base in order to be effective.

Of the 21 schools which reduced book budgets, 11 retained their staff at a constant size and 10 reduced library staff. Conversely, most schools which reduced staff over the past five years held their book funds steady or even increased them. Thirty-two schools reported a decline in staff. As mentioned, ten of these schools also decreased book funds. Fifteen held their book funds steady against inflation and seven actually increased their book funds above inflation.

Almost all of the fluctuation in library staff, both growth and decline, anticipated in the next five years will come in the area of technical services. This may be due to the relative flexibility of this part of a library budget. If student body enrollment and the number of faculty members remain fairly constant, it is difficult for a library to make changes in public services. Book funds, on the other hand, often seem to be the area of a library budget in which changes are easiest and quickest to implement. Since technical services staff respond directly to the flow of materials into a library, we should not be surprised to see that most staff change will occur in this area.

The budgetary picture in the libraries must be viewed in light of planning processes of the seminaries. One hundred-twenty respondents (87%) indicated that financial planning for library expenditures extend only one or two years into the future. Eight schools plan library budgets two to three years in advance and nine schools reported a four to five year planning process.\textsuperscript{98} Given the complexity of library operations and the difficulties in making prompt adjustments in such areas as acquisitions, most schools are not planning adequately for library expenditures. This is further indicated by the data on library facilities.\textsuperscript{99}

Cooperation

Ninety-five schools (68%) are involved in at least one cooperative library program and 51 schools are engaged in more than one

\textsuperscript{98} Compare the data reported by Jones and Hellewell, 1-4.

\textsuperscript{99} Below pp. 85-86.
such program. Only three schools not now involved in a cooperative program plan to enter such a program within five years, and 20 schools plan to engage in additional programs in the next five years.

The average number of members in these cooperative library programs is 4.75 members and the average number of theological libraries in each cooperative program is 3.5. Seventy-one percent of the cooperative library programs are part of a larger and more comprehensive set of arrangements among the schools, although half of the libraries reported that these other agreements did not constitute an important consideration in establishing the library program.

On balance the libraries have preferred programs which essentially are voluntary, with 54 percent of the schools indicating this pattern. Specific contractual agreements govern library cooperation in 14 percent of the instances and joint or unified libraries account for 16 percent of the cooperative programs. Of the schools that plan to enter new cooperative programs within the next five years, however, 50 percent will enter programs either governed by contractual agreements or involving the direct purchase of library services. The new agreements will be more structured and will involve stronger financial commitments on the part of the partners.

Since most of the current cooperative programs are voluntary in nature, it is not surprising that the most common feature of these programs is collection sharing (96%). Nevertheless, fully half of the schools reported that they are sharing resource development, i.e., they are building their collections cooperatively. Technical services are shared by 25 percent of the libraries.

What do the schools expect to receive from these arrangements? Access to other collections viewed as having particular strengths was the most important expectation for 57 percent of the schools, and 30 percent reported this was a moderately important consideration. Forty-five percent reported that they hoped to extend their own collections by developing collections jointly with other schools and 26 percent of the libraries listed this as a moderately important factor.106

106 Libraries that plan to enter cooperative arrangements within the next five years responded similarly. Sixty-one percent planned to do so to gain access to
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In spite of the voluntary nature of most programs for library cooperation and the fact that intensive resource development is not frequently taking place, the librarians view these programs as very important for their schools. Thirty-two percent of the libraries would find the dissolution of their primary cooperative program very detrimental for their school and 55 percent would find this dissolution moderately detrimental. Libraries joined in cooperation with schools granting Ph.D./Th.D. degrees are more likely to view dissolution as very detrimental to their own schools. Withdrawal from the cooperative program by one or two schools would be viewed as very detrimental in 26 percent of the cases, and moderately detrimental in 51 percent of the instances. In 23 percent of the cases, however, the withdrawal of one or two members would be viewed as inconsequential.

Facilities

One of the striking and perhaps disheartening facts about theological libraries generally is that they are in serious need of enlargement and/or some alternative means of accommodating collection growth. Fully 44 percent of the libraries have stack space sufficient for less than five years. Another 17 percent will need stack space within ten years. More discouraging is the fact that 44 percent of the schools have enlarged their library since 1980 and 63 percent have done so since 1975. Thirty-eight percent of the schools which have enlarged their stack capacity since 1980 will need more space within five years and 42 percent of the buildings that have been enlarged since 1975 have stack space only for another five years. On the positive side, 14 percent of the schools will not face a shortage of stack space until 1994-1999, and another 25 percent will not have a stack space shortage until the next century.

These data indicate that library facility planning and construction is being done on a cycle that is much too short. A prudent target for library construction would be to build or enlarge librar-

collections judged to have particular strengths and 44 percent planned to do so to extend resources by cooperative collection development.
ies for between 15 and 30 years of growth. Many schools are making short term adjustments to provide library space without really addressing long term solutions. Both the severe shortage of expansion space and frequent construction create major disruptions in library service. They reduce library effectiveness and direct professional staff time away from bibliographic priorities.

There is relatively little uniformity in the ways in which the schools will respond to the shortage of stack space. Forty-five schools (65%) have already built expansion space which they plan to use for library growth when needed. Otherwise, new construction seems to be the preferred solution. Fifty-six schools indicate that they will build a new addition to their library and 29 schools will build a new library facility. Forty will undertake internal renovation and enlargement. Fifty-seven schools plan to use compact shelving to achieve building efficiency, but traditional book storage is relatively undesirable. Twenty-nine schools will consider storing books in their own facilities and only 19 schools are willing to contemplate cooperative book storage. Collection weeding is much more popular with 54 schools planning to restrain collection growth through this means and 58 schools plan on the greater use of microtext as a way of achieving space economy in their libraries. Solutions which involve construction are ranked less likely than they are desirable, and solutions which essentially conserve building space, i.e., the use of microform are ranked as more likely than they are desirable. Otherwise, there are few differences between the desired solution to library space problems and the solutions that the schools are likely to adopt.

Preservation

Slightly more than one third (35%) of responding institutions have some type of preservation program, but many more (132 in the 1981-1982 fiscal year) are spending money on preservation activities. Of the libraries spending money for preservation work, 72 percent spent less than $1,000 and 19 percent spent between

---
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$2,000 and $5,000. Ten schools spent more than $5,000 and only six spent more than $10,000.\textsuperscript{102}

Financial expenditure for preservation as a percentage of acquisitions budgets is not dramatic. Eighty-five percent of the libraries are spending between one percent and five percent of their acquisition budget for this purpose and an another 10 percent of the libraries expend 10 percent of their book budget for preservation. Thirty-four percent of the libraries consider future support for preservation work highly likely and 25 percent consider such support possible. Sixteen percent, however, are not planning on continued support for preservation work.

Book repair and rebinding are the most common preservation techniques used. Restricted shelving is also heavily used, while microfilm is considered a preservation activity by only 38 of the libraries and ranks in popularity with direct replacement by an original copy.

Personnel

Seven responding institutions have no library personnel who hold a professional or academic appointment. In 49 schools one librarian holds such an appointment and in 37 schools two librarians hold professional or academic appointment. The average number of persons holding these appointments for all institutions is 2.3.

On balance our theological librarians appear well trained, although this obtains more for bibliography and librarianship than for theology. Respondents strongly wish their staff members to be trained in librarianship, but prefer theological training as well. Doctoral degrees are viewed as much less important and only 15 percent of the librarians who serve in responding institutions hold research doctorates.

ATLA Effectiveness

One hundred-five respondents (75%) were personal members of ATLA and 46 of these persons (33%) had held elected or appointed

\textsuperscript{102} Expenditures reported for the 1981-1982 fiscal year.
offices in ATLA within the past five years. These respondents were asked to rank general programs and services of the ATLA for both their importance to local institutions and their effectiveness. Table 7 provides a number of significant observations in this regard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATLA Activity</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representing the needs of theological libraries in national bibliographic</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and library developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing continuing education for</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theological librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring the publication of</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theological bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating intellectual in bibliography and librarianship</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring research for theological library planning</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating activities and professional concerns with ATS</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating national library cooperation</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating intellectual growth in theological disciplines</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing services to local institutions</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating regional library cooperation</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating professional concerns with other professional/learned societies</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is clear in the first instance is that professional development is viewed as a significantly more important role for the ATLA than library program coordination. The respondents also expect the ATLA to exercise more leadership in national program coordination than in regional matters and think the ATLA is more effective in doing so than it is at the regional level.

Overall, the ATLA is not perceived as effective; most of the rankings falling between 2.0 (moderately effective) and 3.0 (inef-
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effective) and none of ranking falling between 1.0 (very effective) and 2.0. From Table 8 however, we see that some ATLA programs are considered very effective. The highest ranking go to activities which have quite clear objectives. The Board of Microtext and Index Board were begun with modest foundation support and have had executive leadership. The Index Board also has salaried staff.

TABLE 8
Importance and Effectiveness of Selected ATLA Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Board</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical Exchange</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Conferences as a source of professional development</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Microtext</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Service</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Placement Service</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the more recent undertakings of the Association are considered as effective as the older services.

These data point to a fundamental dichotomy within the ATLA. It is an organization which intends to encourage personal professional development and also intends to implement and coordinate library development, i.e., institutional development. It is perceived as more effective in the former endeavors than in the latter. In part this lack of effectiveness in coordination and program development may be due to the structure of the association.\footnote{ATLA is not structured in ways which easily sustain developmental or coordinating activities nor does its structure invite strong institutional commitment. It is without fulltime executive leadership, has a small annual budget and minimal operating reserves, and no endowment. Thus, it is likely that the ATLA will need to make serious constitutional changes in order for it to achieve effectively its role in program planning and coordination.}
Finally, respondents were asked to rank certain areas of library service and program development in order of importance to the goals and purposes of their libraries. While the ATLA as well as other library agencies are engaged in some of these areas, the respondents were asked only to rank these factors on the basis of local institutional needs. Table 9 shows the results.

Clearly the librarians sense the need to strengthen their local institutional services and resources. Financial and staff development rank very high. Regional cooperation rather than national cooperation also apparently provides greater assistance to local institutions. While some programs, especially preservation, probably cannot be done effectively on a regional basis, it is necessary nevertheless to recognize the preference for local and regional implementing strategies.

Personal Epilogue

In addition to the statistical findings of this survey, it is possible to gain general impressions about the current state of theological libraries and about the direction in which they are moving. These impressions are a personal reading and interpretation of the survey data.

In the first place one senses a general competence which obtains among theological library officers. This impression is formed on the basis of the regional consultations as well as the questionnaire results. Individual questionnaire responses reflect a consistency which indicates that local libraries, by and large, operate

Another way of assessing the viability of the ATLA as an organization capable of implementing and sustaining major national initiatives in library development is to consider its membership in constitutional and numerical terms. The ATLA admits personal members and institutional members. Personal members are defined essentially as "persons who are actively engaged in professional library or bibliographic work in theological or religious fields." Institutional members include libraries of ATS institutions, other accrediting schools engaged predominately in post-college theological education, and special theological research libraries. While institutions are members, apart from voting on certain questions, institutional members are not recognized in the Association's structure, e.g., no directors are elected as institutional directors.
Survey Analysis

TABLE 9
Local Library Needs

Mean Score Ranking in Order of Importance (1 – highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating library services more effectively with teaching/research programs</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen collection holdings</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing financial support for library services</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing professional/managerial education for staff</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide higher level of reader services</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation in resource sharing</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen local planning procedures</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional structures to plan and develop the use of new technologies</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing theological education for staff</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to consultative services in such areas as</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation for accreditation, use of new technologies, management, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve/increase building space for collections</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in regional program of cooperative collection development</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater coordination of services and resources regionally</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater coordination of services and resources denominationally</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation in reader services</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve/increase building space for readers and/or staff</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in a regional program for collection preservation</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in a national program for collection preservation</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National structures to plan and develop the use of new technologies</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater coordination of services and resources nationally</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in a national program of collection development</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

according to well considered service objectives and internal procedures. The ranking of local institutional needs correlates with much of the data reported in other sections of the questionnaire.
There are indicators, however, which suggest that the pursuit of long range goals is being hindered in many schools by a lack of planning and program continuity.

Another impression is that a significant number of theological libraries have turned decisively toward the center or mainstream of academic librarianship. Among other indicators, this is evidenced or even occasioned by the computer-based bibliographic systems which are being used widely. The professional concerns voiced by theological librarians for the most part are concerns shared by librarians serving in colleges and universities. Theological librarians exercise leadership in major professional societies and activities. National trends in library service impact significantly on theological libraries. Many theological libraries cooperate closely with state, regional, and even municipal library programs. This move to the mainstream of librarianship, on balance, must be considered a benefit.

On the other hand, one senses that the advantages theological libraries are gaining from their closer association with the mainstream of academic librarianship are offset by the loss of inclination or motivation to build truly specialized library services for theological education and ministerial practice. One notes the lack of significant bibliographic systems or services which are structured by the needs of theological education and/or the practice of ministry. While there are some services which deal primarily with theological literature, e.g., the work of the Index Board of the ATLA, but these enterprises deal primarily with the literature itself. The systems, the methods of citation or documentation, the subject analyses are not shaped precisely by the particular needs of theological education or the profession of ministry. Theological librarianship has not emerged as a highly articulated professional specialization and probably will not do so in the anticipated future.

This turning to general academic librarianship appears to be accompanied by a yielding concern for theology and theological education among librarians serving the seminaries. Librarianship is becoming more demanding technically and the service load in many institutions seems to be extremely heavy. Of course, there appears to be a general trend toward specialization in the seminary no less than elsewhere in higher education. These factors
may contribute to this weakening concern for theology and theological education among librarians. In any event, the librarians appear to have less clarity or understanding about the central work of theological education than about the techniques of library service and there is uncertainty about the more serious contributions which libraries make to the enterprise as a whole.

Many of the technical advances, particularly the widespread and growing use of computers in theological libraries is timely and right-headed. The proposed use of micro-computers and the innovation and experimentation which these machines facilitate also should be encouraged.

Another set of impressions cluster around the issue of library cooperation. There is in fact a certain ambiguity about this issue. In the first instance, one is impressed by the high number of cooperative programs operating among theological libraries. It would appear that many institutions inaugurated cooperative library programs as a means of improving the quality of library service while realizing certain economies and efficiencies. On close examination, however, one notices that most of this activity represents only the easiest component of library cooperation, i.e., resource sharing. While this is not unimportant, many more substantial steps, programs, and commitments will be needed for the full potential of library cooperation to be realized. In order to justify the resources they require, these programs will need to intensify their efforts to strengthen and not only share resources and services.

That these next steps in library cooperation are not readily forthcoming may be due chiefly to a strong institutional sense of autonomy and self-sufficiency which obtains in almost every school. These sensitivities of course are most appropriate. Yet institutions must find ways to maintain control over local resources and the quality of local programs within the arena of library cooperation.

Almost paradoxically, these same institutional proclivities have not produced a high degree of local self-confidence about library development. The continuing concern for a statement of criteria of library adequacy and the highly ranked need to strengthen local resources suggest a continuing uncertainty about
the purpose, scope, and quality of libraries. One would not expect this perplexity regarding an essential, long-standing, and familiar educational resource. In many schools internal administrative procedures and library leadership both must be strengthened in order to restore institutional self-confidence about library resources and services.

One senses, finally, a subtle optimism on the part of some theological librarians and academic administrators in the face of severe challenges. This report has identified several stubborn and complex problems facing theological libraries. Yet instead of resignation, one detects a certain hopefulness. Important first steps are being taken, albeit slowly, to resolve some of these issues constructively. Even the few retrospective conversion projects reported and the embryonic ATLA preservation program represent such steps. Institutions of strength and imagination are planning and acting boldly and without fear of isolation. Like-minded institutions will act in concert and the whole will be strengthened by their leadership. Long-range but clear objectives, stable and modestly enlarged resources, and administrative and faculty accord will help translate this optimism into specific and beneficial action.

104 See Carroll, 112, 118 and question 70.
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QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES\textsuperscript{105}

1. Identify the institution for which you are reporting. (R = 141)
   Schools were identified so that data could be compared with data supplied in the ATLA Statistical Report. All analyses for this questionnaire were done without reference to institutional identification.

2. What classification system(s) does your library use principally for current cataloguing? (R = 139)
   
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 5\% UTS
   \item 19\% DDC
   \item 74\% LC
   \item 2\% Other
   \end{itemize}

3. If your library has changed classification system within the last ten years, which classification was last used before the change? (R = 61)
   
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 28\% UTS
   \item 38\% DDC
   \item 6\% LC
   \item 28\% Other
   \end{itemize}

4. If your library has changed classification within the last ten years, are you reclassifying material from the previous classification? (R = 54)
   
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 56\% Selectively
   \item 7\% Certain sub-collections
   \item 37\% Comprehensively
   \end{itemize}

5. Does your library anticipate changing classification system within the next five years? (R = 133)
   
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 2\% Yes
   \item 98\% No
   \end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{105} The number of respondents is indicated in parentheses. All percentages are expressed in whole numbers. When the number of respondents to a given question is quite small, e.g., questions 5, 7 and 14, the percentages have not been calculated.
6. If yes, which classification system will your library adopt? (R = 9)
   1 UTS
   0 DDC
   8 LC
   0 Other

7. If your library plans to change classification, do you plan to reclassify material from the previous classification? (R = 140)
   132 Does not apply
   6 Selectively
   0 Certain sub-collections
   2 Comprehensively

8. Is your library a member of a bibliographical utility? (R = 140)
   34% No
   54% OCLC
   6% UTLAS
   1% RLIN
   4% Other

9. What year did you join this utility/network? (R = 83)
   27% Before 1975
   55% 1976-1980
   18% After 1980

10. Which library functions in your institution are computer assisted through this utility/network (either on-line or off-line)? (R = 83)
    75% Cataloguing
    16% Acquisitions
    12% Serials control
    58% Inter-library lending
    5% Circulation
    9% Reserve management
    5% Book fund accounting
    3% General accounting
    21% Data-base searching
    7% Other
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11. Is your library converting cataloguing records to a machine readable format? (R = 82)
   44% Very selectively
   16% Actively on some basis, e.g., use
   5% Certain sub-collections
   35% Comprehensively

12. If comprehensively, in what year do you anticipate that this conversion will be completed? (R = 26)
   8% By 1980
   58% By 1985
   27% By 1990
   8% After 1990

13. If your library is not now a member of a bibliographic utility, do you plan to join a utility? (R = 25)
   10 Yes, within ten years
   15 Yes, within the next five years

14. Which bibliographic utility or network is your library likely to join? (R = 25)
   23 OCLC
   1 UTLAS
   0 RLIN
   1 Other

15. What is(are) the format(s) of your principal public catalogue? (Check all that apply) (R = 140)
   94% Cards
   17% Computer output microform
   6% On-line computer
   1% Book
   1% Other

16. Does your library plan to use a computer output microform catalogue/catalogue supplement? (R = 140)
   9% Yes, within the next ten years
   14% Yes, within the next five years
17. Does your library plan to use an on-line catalogue/supplement? (R = 140)
   27% Yes, within the next ten years?
   16% Yes, within the next five years?

18. For which library functions are you using a micro-computer? (R = 136)
   80% None
   7% Cataloguing
   5% Acquisitions
   3% Serials control
   2% Inter-library lending
   2% Circulation
   3% Reserve management
   6% Book fund accounting
   3% General accounting
   4% Data-base searching
   7% Other

19. Within the next five years, for which library functions do you anticipate that you will use a micro-computer? (R = 140)
   30% None
   21% Cataloguing
   43% Acquisitions
   36% Serials control
   8% Inter-library lending
   34% Circulation
   18% Reserve management
   38% Book fund accounting
   28% General accounting
   26% Data-base searching
   12% Other, specify

20. Does your library systematically report its holdings to the National Union Catalog? (R = 140)
   27% Yes

---

106 This question and question 21 also asked in what year the library began reporting to the NUC and/or the ULS. The responses, however, were inconclusive.
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21. Does your library systematically report its holdings to the Union List of Serials/New Serial Titles? (R = 140)
   13% Yes
22. Are any of your library holdings reported in other union catalogues? (R = 140)
   66% Yes
23. Does your library house AND service the archives of your institution? (R = 140)
   59% Yes
24. Does your library house AND service the archives of another institution or organization? (R = 140)
   29% Yes
25. Identify collections in your library other than the archives identified in questions 23 and 24 above, which generally would be considered to be of national prominence. A useful test of national prominence would be if students enroll in your school or scholars visit your library specifically to use these materials. The intent of this question is to identify collections which pertain to particular subjects, which reflect a particular provenance, and/or which document a particular chronological era. Please indicate if such collections include materials in special formats, e.g., manuscripts. (R = 140)
   79 Libraries (56%) reported holding special collection.107
26. Approximately what percentage of your annual acquisitions budget is budgeted to develop these collections? (R = 79)
   27% Collection not being developed currently
   48% 0-5%
   13% 6-10%
   2% 11-20%
   10% 20+%
27. How far ahead does your institution do budget planning for library expenditures? (R = 140)
   87% 1-2 years
   6% 2-3 years
   6% 4-5 years
   1% More than five years

107 See pp. 80-81 for a detailed analysis of these responses.
28. Over the past five years, have the funds budgeted for library materials in your institution (R = 140)
   65% Remained fairly constant, keeping pace with inflation
   20% Increased above inflation
   15% Decreased?

29. If, over the past five years, funds for library materials in your institution have increased (R = 28) or decreased (R = 21), how have you adjusted to this change?
   96% Acquired more material in all fields
   81% Acquired less material in all fields
   19% Acquired more material in special fields
   24% Acquired less material in special fields
   7% Acquired more expensive materials
   43% Acquired less expensive materials
   56% Increased subscriptions and/or standing orders
   67% Decreased subscriptions and/or standing orders
   37% Increased binding expenditures
   20% Decreased binding expenditures
   22% Increased foreign acquisitions
   57% Decreased foreign acquisitions
   15% Increased expenditures for preservation
   19% Decreased expenditures for preservation
   11% Other increase
   9% Other decrease

30. Over the next five years, do you anticipate that funds budgeted for library materials in your institution will (R = 140)
   63% Remain fairly constant, but keep pace with inflation
   20% Increase above the pace of inflation
   8% Decrease
   9% No estimate

31. If, over the next five years, you anticipate that funds for library materials in your institution will increase (R = 27) or decrease (R = 11), how will you adjust to this change?
   81% Acquire more material in all fields
   60% Acquire less material in all fields
   18% Acquire more material in special fields.
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30% Acquire less material in special fields.
18% Acquire more expensive materials
10% Acquire less expensive materials
48% Increase subscriptions and/or standing orders
30% Decrease subscriptions and/or standing orders
37% Increase binding expenditures
40% Decrease binding expenditures
37% Increase foreign acquisitions
20% Decrease foreign acquisitions
41% Increase expenditures for preservation
10% Decrease expenditures for preservation
4% Other increase
20% Other decrease

32. Over the past five years, has your FTE staff size (R = 140)
   53% Remained constant
   23% Increased in number
   23% Decreased in number?

33. If your library staff increased or decreased in size in the past five years, in what areas did the increase (R = 32) or decrease (R = 32) take place?
   69% Technical services increase
   74% Technical services decrease
   47% Reader services increase
   35% Reader services decrease
   12% Administration increase
   26% Administration decrease
   16% Archives/special collections increase
   3% Archives/special collections decrease
   9% Audio-visual services increase
   13% Audio-visual services decrease
   22% Computer services increase
   0% Computer services decrease
   9% Other increase
   6% Other decrease
34. Over the next five years, do you anticipate that your FTE staff size (R = 140)

69% Will remain constant
25% Will increase in number
6% Will decrease in number?

35. If you anticipate that your library staff will decrease or increase in size in the next five years, in what areas is the increase (R = 33) or decrease (R = 9) likely to take place?

58% Technical services increase
100% Technical services decrease
41% Reader services increase
22% Reader services decrease
16% Administration increase
22% Administration decrease
9% Archives/special collections increase
11% Archives/special collections decrease
25% Audio-visual services increase
11% Audio-visual services decrease
25% Computer services increase
0% Computer services decrease
0% Other increase
0% Other decrease

The following questions deal with cooperative arrangements. Cooperation here means, minimally, arrangements between two or more libraries to develop and/or share resources and/or services. A cooperative program has some continuing structure or mechanism to plan and monitor the arrangements. It is more specific than, say, the general inter-library loan system. For the purpose of these questions participation in a computer data base should be excluded (see question No. 8 above) UNLESS such participation involves cooperative services over and above sharing bibliographical data.

36. In how many distinct cooperative programs is your library engaged? (R = 140)

23% None
41% One
18% Two
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12% Three  
4% Four  
2% More than four  
Mean = 1.42

(If your library is not engaged in a cooperative program, go to question 47.)

If your library is involved in more than one cooperative program, please answer the following questions in terms of that program or set of arrangements which has the most direct and necessary bearing on the day to day work of your library, i.e., that cooperative program which you consider primary.

37. How many institutions are involved in this cooperative program? (R = 61)
   11% One  
   18% Two  
   11% Three  
   5% Four  
   13% Five  
   8% Six  
   15% Seven  
   18% More than seven  
   Mean = 4.75

38. How many of these institutions are theological schools?  
   (R = 79)
   33% One  
   16% Two  
   11% Three  
   6% Four  
   9% Five  
   2% Six  
   13% Seven  
   9% More than seven  
   Mean = 4.75

39. Does your institution have non-library cooperative agreements, e.g., cross registration, with any of the other institutions? (R = 94)
   76% Yes
40. Do any of these programs involve institutions supporting research doctoral degrees? (R = 91)
   22% Yes
   Research doctoral degrees in religion or theology?
   44% Yes

41. Which of the following statements most accurately describes your primary cooperative library program. (R = 96)
   34% A voluntary program in which institutions have agreed to share resources and/or services with little or no coordination.
   20% A voluntary program in which institutions have agreed to share resources and/or services with considerable coordination.
   15% A program in which institutions have contracted together to coordinate resources development and/or services.
   0% A program in which institutions have contracted to purchase library resources and/or services from another institution.
   8% A program in which institutions have contracted to provide financial support jointly for some library resource and/or service.
   2% A program in which institutions have contracted to fund and develop a common or unified library housed in more than one location or facility.
   5% A program in which institutions have contracted to fund and develop a common or unified library in one location or facility.
   16% Other

42. What programs and/or services are shared in this arrangement? (Check all that apply) (R = 98)
   92% Resource sharing
   48% Resource development
   24% Technical services
   8% Fund raising
   4% Book shelving
   14% Administration and/or staff
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20% Staff training
14% Equipment
8% Other

43. By whom has this cooperative program been negotiated? (R = 96)
61% Library directors
33% Chief academic officer of the schools
4% Trustees
1% Other

44. Rank the following considerations in order of their relative importance in establishing the cooperative library program. (1 = very important, 2 = moderately important, 3 = not important) (R = 89)
1.58 Other libraries had distinct strengths considered important to our institution
1.83 Intentional desire to extend resources by coordinated acquisitions
1.80 Intentional desire to extend other resources or services by coordination
2.26 The schools involved had other cooperative programs

45. How detrimental would the dissolution of this arrangement be for your institution? (R = 96)
32% Very detrimental
55% Moderately detrimental
12% Inconsequential

46. How detrimental would the resignation of one or two institutions from this program be for your institution? (R = 94)
26% Very detrimental
51% Moderately detrimental
23% Inconsequential

47. Does your institution plan to enter a cooperative library program within the next five years? (R = 102)
25% Yes
48. If your institution plans to enter a cooperative library program in the next five years, which type of program are you likely to join? (R = 36)

16% A voluntary program in which institutions have agreed to share resources and/or services with little or no coordination.

22% A voluntary program in which institutions have agreed to share resources and/or services with considerable coordination.

33% A program in which institutions have contracted together to coordinate resources development and/or services.

6% A program in which institutions have contracted to purchase resources and/or services from another institution.

3% A program in which institutions have contracted to provide financial support jointly for some library resource and/or service.

6% A program in which institutions have contracted to fund and develop a common or unified library housed in more than one location or facility.

3% A program in which institutions have contracted to fund and develop a common or unified library in one location or facility.

11% Other

49. For how many years will your present library facility accommodate collection growth (assume current level of growth)? (R = 131)

44% 1-5 years

17% 6-10 years

14% 11-15 years

25% 16+ years

50. In what year was the shelving capacity of your library facility last expanded? (R = 128)

1% Before 1940

1% 1940-1949

2% 1950-1959
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15% 1960-1969
33% 1970-1979
48% After 1980

51. When your present book stack capacity is filled, which of the following options would be MOST DESIRABLE? (Rank these options numerically with 1 = the most desirable. Use the same number for options which are equally desirable.) (R = 101)
   2.37 Use of pre-planned expansion space already built
   2.70 A newly constructed addition to the present building
   3.79 A new library building
   2.89 Renovation of the present building to provide more efficient use of space
   2.60 Use of compact shelving
   3.37 Use of a book storage facility for your own institution
   4.62 Use of a storage facility shared with other institutions
   2.26 Collection weeding to achieve approximate zero volume growth
   3.06 Replacement of physical volumes with microform or disk storage

52. When your present book stack capacity is filled, which of the following options is your institution MOST LIKELY TO ADOPT? (Rank these options numerically with 1 = most likely. Use the same number for options which are equally likely.) (R = 93)
   2.46 Use of pre-planned expansion space already built
   3.39 A newly constructed addition to the present building
   4.83 A new library building
   3.30 Renovation of present building to provide more efficient use of space
   2.61 Use of compact shelving
   3.16 Use of a book storage facility for your own institution
   4.49 Use of a storage facility shared with other institutions
2.62 Collection weeding to achieve approximate zero volume growth
2.59 Replacement of physical volumes with microform or disk storage

53. Does your library now have an active program of collection preservation/conservation? (R = 139)
   37% Yes

54. Indicate the extent the following are used for collection preservation/conservation (1 = used substantially, 2 = used moderately, 3 = used infrequently, 4 = virtually not used) (R = 121)
   2.10 Book repair with conservation material
   1.73 Rebinding
   3.10 Oiling
   3.29 Casing
   2.50 Removal of material from open shelving/storage of material under controlled conditions
   2.72 Direct replacement in original format
   3.50 Replacement with acid-free photocopy
   2.76 Replacement with microfilm
   3.82 Deacidification

55. Approximately how much money did your library spend for preservation purposes last year (do not include money spent on first time binding of periodicals and paper bound books.) (R = 131)
   73% less than $1,000
   19% $2,000-$5,000
   3% $6,000-$10,000
   5% More than $10,000

56. Approximately what percentage of your acquisitions budget last year (i.e., 1981-1982) does this represent? (R = 114)
   84% 1-5%
   10% 6-10%
   1% 11-15%
   2% 16-20%
   3% More than 20%
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57. How likely is budgetary support for preservation to continue in the future? (R = 131)
   37% Highly likely
   27% Possibly but not certain
   18% Very unlikely
   18% No estimate

58. Rank the following preservation activities in order of their importance to your institution. (1 = highest importance, 2 = moderately important, 3 = important but not urgent 4 = least important) (R = 116)
   1.46 Preservation of special collection material in your own library
   1.58 Preservation of useful material of enduring value to scholarship already held by your library
   2.78 Preservation of useful material of enduring value to scholarship which your library does not presently have
   1.64 Preservation of specialized collections reflecting the denominational and/or theological tradition of your institution
   2.90 A large scale preservation program aimed at thorough bibliographic coverage at least within predetermined guidelines
   2.77 Preservation of specialized collections in other libraries generally considered to be outstanding for theological study

59. How many staff members in your library have faculty or professional appointment? (R = 134)
   36% 1
   28% 2
   7% 3
   8% 4
   7% 5
   4% 6
   4% 7
   6% More than 7
   Mean = 2.38
60. Indicate the earned degrees for each staff member in your library who has a faculty or professional appointment. (R = 132)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 4</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 6</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 348)

61. How important is it for professional staff members in your library to hold the following degrees? (1 = very important, 2 = moderately important, 3 = desirable, 4 = not a factor) (R = 129)

1.22 Library science degree
2.24 M.Div. degree
2.13 Both the M.L.S. degree and the M.Div. degree
3.80 Doctorate in Library Science
3.33 Th.D or Ph.D. (in Religion)
3.79 Ph.D. in another field, please specify

62. Are you a personal member of ATLA? (R = 140)

75% Yes

63. Of what professional and/or scholarly societies other than ATLA are you a member? (R = 140)

86% of the respondents reported membership in other societies. The lack of uniformity in abbreviations and acronyms made detailed analysis of these memberships impractical.

64. How many staff members in your institution, including yourself, are personal members of ATLA? (R = 131)

24% No members
36% 1 member
20% 2 members
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6%  3 Members
9%  4 Members
5%  More than 4 members
Mean = 1.63

65. Have you held an elected or appointed office in ATLA within the last decade? (R = 140)
   33%  Yes

66. How effective do you think the ATLA has been in the last decade in the following areas? (1 = Very effective, 2 = moderately effective, 3 = ineffective, 4 = no opinion) (R = 118)
   3.06 Coordinating regional library cooperation
   2.72 Coordinating national library cooperation
   2.23 Providing continuing education for theological librarians
   2.69 Sponsoring research for theological library planning and development
   2.56 Coordinating activities/professional concerns with the Association of Theological Schools
   3.11 Coordinating activities/professional concerns with other professional/learned societies
   2.48 Representing the needs of theological libraries in national bibliographic and library developments
   2.36 Stimulating professional/intellectual growth in bibliography
   2.82 Stimulating intellectual growth in the theological disciplines
   2.19 Sponsoring/encouraging the preparation and publication of theological bibliography
   3.10 Providing support services for local institutions

67. How effective do you think the following ATLA programs have been in the last decade? (1 = Very effective, 2 = moderately effective, 3 = ineffective, 4 = no opinion) (R = 126)
   1.90 Board of Microtext
   1.61 Index Board
   2.20 Annual Conferences as a source of professional development
   3.43 Personnel Placement Service
3.05 Library Consultation Program
1.78 Periodical Exchange
2.45 Publication Program

68. How IMPORTANT SHOULD the following concerns and/or services be for the ATLA? (1 = Very important, 2 = moderately important, 3 = not important, 4 = no opinion) (R = 122)
   2.19 Coordinating regional library cooperation
   1.83 Coordinating national library cooperation
   1.42 Providing continuing education for theological librarians
   1.54 Sponsoring research for theological library planning and development
   1.64 Coordinating activities/professional concerns with the Association of Theological Schools
   2.32 Coordinating activities/professional concerns with other professional/learned societies
   1.40 Representing the needs of theological libraries in national bibliographic and library developments
   1.53 Stimulating professional/intellectual growth in bibliography and librarianship
   1.92 Stimulating intellectual growth in the theological disciplines
   1.42 Sponsoring/encouraging the preparation and publication of theological bibliography
   2.13 Providing support services for local institutions

69. How important are the following ATLA programs for your library? (1 = Very important, 2 = moderately important, 3 = not important, 4 = no opinion) (R = 130)
   2.97 Board of Microtext
   1.42 Index Board
   3.06 Personnel Placement Service
   1.88 Annual Conferences as a source of professional development
   2.77 Library Consultation Program
   1.71 Periodical Exchange
   1.02 Publication Program
Appendix A

70 In terms of the long range goals and purposes of your institution, what are the important needs of the library? Please add items to the following list and then rank each item in terms of its importance to your institution. (1 = very important, 2 = moderately important, 3 = helpful, 4 = relatively unimportant) (R = 126)

1.86 Continuing professional/managerial education for staff members
2.28 Continuing theological education for staff members
1.90 Provide higher level of reader services
1.48 Strengthen collection holdings
2.34 Participation in a regional program of cooperative collection development
2.81 Participation in a national program of cooperative collection development
2.32 Improve/increase building space for collections
2.53 Improve/increase building space for readers and/or staff
2.55 Participation in a regional cooperative program for collection preservation
2.57 Participation in a national cooperative program for collection preservation
2.31 Access to special consultative services in such areas as preparation for accreditation, use of new technologies, management, etc.
1.94 Cooperation in resource sharing
2.38 Cooperation in reader services
2.36 Greater coordination of service and resources denominationally
2.35 Greater coordination of service and resources regionally
2.65 Greater coordination of service and resources nationally
2.27 Regional structures to plan and develop the use of new technologies
2.63 National structures to plan and develop the use of new technologies
2.17 Strengthening local planning procedures
1.56 Increasing financial support for library services
1.47 Integrating more effectively library services with the teaching/research programs of your institution

Thank you.