

# **Survey of the State of Audio Collections in Academic Libraries**

by Abby Smith, David Randal Allen,  
and Karen Allen

Council on Library and Information Resources  
Washington, D.C.  
August 2004

ISBN 1-932326-11-1

Published by:

**Council on Library and Information Resources**

**1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 500**

**Washington, DC 20036**

Web site at <http://www.clir.org>

Additional copies are available for \$20 per copy. Orders must be placed through CLIR's Web site.



The paper in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Copyright 2004 by the Council on Library and Information Resources. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transcribed in any form without permission of the publisher. Requests for reproduction should be submitted to the Director of Communications at the Council on Library and Information Resources.

---

## **Contents**

About the Authors .....	iv
Audio Collections Advisory Group .....	v
Acknowledgments .....	vi
<b>PART 1, by Abby Smith .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction.....	1
Scope, Design, and Methodology of the Survey .....	3
Summary of Findings .....	10
Conclusions .....	20
<b>PART 2, by David Randal Allen and Karen Allen .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Extended Results of the Surveys	
Combining Answers from the Two Survey Groups .....	24
Appendix 1. Scan of Recorded-Sound Surveys .....	54
Appendix 2. Survey Respondents .....	59

## About the Authors

**Abby Smith** is director of programs at CLIR. She is responsible for developing and managing collaborative programs with key library and archival institutions to ensure long-term access to our cultural and scholarly heritage. Before joining CLIR in 1997, she had worked at the Library of Congress for nine years, first as a consultant to the special collections divisions, then as coordinator of several cultural and academic programs in the offices of the Librarian of Congress and the Associate Librarian for Library Services. She is the author or coauthor of several CLIR publications, including *Access in the Future Tense*, *New Model Scholarship: How Will it Survive?*, and *Folk Heritage Collections in Crisis*.

**David Randal Allen** has worked with audio, video, and digital technologies to store and transmit radio and television news programming since the late 1960s. For most of the last 30 years, Mr. Allen has worked as a news producer and reporter (assigned to cover Capitol Hill, the State Department, and the White House). He has also been an editor, news director, and managing editor for wire services, television, and radio news operations including the Associated Press, NBC Radio Network, and Standard News. He is currently vice president of The Communications Office, Inc., a consultancy providing communication services for information, library, and a variety of corporate and non-profit clients. Mr. Allen served two terms as secretary of the National Press Club.

**Karen Allen** began her career at CBS Television Network in Washington, DC, in the early 1970s and worked as a television producer for a WWL-TV, New Orleans, through the 1980s. Ms. Allen shifted to public affairs, taught at Tulane University, and returned to Washington, DC, to work for natural history and conservation organizations. In 1995, she founded The Communications Office, Inc. As company president, she has directed projects concerning communication issues for organizations including The Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, the Congressional Research Service, the Council on Library and Information Resources, and the National Archives. Ms. Allen is on the board of the Institute for Learning Innovation and is an advisor to Disney's Animal Kingdom.

---

## **Audio Collections Advisory Group**

*Connie Brooks*

Head, Preservation Department  
Stanford University Libraries

*Samuel S. Brylawski*

Head, Recorded Sound Section  
Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division  
Library of Congress

*Mary M. Case*

Director, Office of Scholarly Communication  
Association of Research Libraries

(As of July 1, University Librarian, University of Illinois, Chicago)

*Virginia Danielson*

Richard F. French Librarian  
Loeb Music Library  
Harvard University

*Jim Farrington*

Head of Public Services  
Sibley Music Library  
Eastman School of Music

*Peter McDonald*

Associate Librarian for Collection Development  
Syracuse University Library

*Daniel Reed*

Director, Archives of Traditional Music  
Assistant Professor, Department of Folklore and Ethnomusicology  
Indiana University

*David Seubert*

Curator, Performing Arts Collection  
Davidson Library Special Collections  
University of California, Santa Barbara

*Michael Taft*

Head, Archive of Folk Culture  
American Folklife Center  
Library of Congress

## **Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to express their appreciation to the many people who helped make this survey report possible.

First, we thank the respondents themselves. Even before the survey process began, we realized that completing the lengthy questionnaire would be a time-consuming process. The library directors and others charged with responding would need to communicate with numerous units inside their own institutions to gather basic information. We are grateful to these leaders for making participation in our study a priority for their institutions. We also thank the librarians, special collections managers, archivists, audio specialists, catalogers, preservationists, and others who were responsible for reporting on their collections. The collective answers have revealed both the uniqueness of library collections and the shared challenges of preserving them.

Perhaps the only task more challenging than responding to this survey was helping develop the tool and interpreting its findings. For this reason, we are also grateful to the experts who served as our advisory group. With patience and good humor, they shared with us their knowledge, their wisdom, and their passion for the aural culture held in libraries and archives.

# PART 1

by Abby Smith

## Introduction

---

The libraries and archives of the United States house a large and valuable heritage of audio recordings that span more than a century. Ranging from work songs recorded in the field to whale songs recorded in the Pacific Ocean, from Native Americans speaking in tongues now close to extinction to Holocaust survivors recalling their experiences, these collections of recorded sound are an irreplaceable record of the history and creativity of the twentieth century. These collections are of enormous value for research and teaching. These rare and often fragile recordings, however, are in triple jeopardy: They are frequently not described or inventoried; they are orphaned by obsolete playback equipment; and they lack clearly documented rights that allow use. Making these recordings available to students and scholars can be difficult and costly. As a result, these collections are often underused.

Awareness that our audio heritage is in peril has reached the highest levels of government. In 2000, the U.S. Congress enacted the National Recording Preservation Act (NRPA). Under this act, Congress will make available matching funds to preserve historically important collections. It will thereby join the ranks of other funders, including the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute for Museum and Library Services, and private foundations, that make funding available for institutions to improve access to and preservation of historically and culturally significant recorded sound collections. Just as important, the act calls for a series of activities designed to improve preservation techniques and raise awareness of our audio heritage.

The funds provided under the act will become available through a congressionally authorized foundation that will be aimed at preservation. Unfortunately, many factors might make it difficult for a library with important holdings in need of preservation to compete

successfully for these funds. These factors range from lack of knowledge about what is in a given collection to a lack of consensus about what materials merit priority for preservation. These are problems that libraries can solve, and knowing that funds will be available for preservation may give them the incentive to address those problems in a timely fashion.

In 2003, to focus attention on this problem and spur discussion on how to resolve it, the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) undertook a survey of the state of audio recordings in academic libraries. One purpose of the survey was to inform decision makers in those libraries, as well as in funding agencies, about the scale and extent of barriers to preservation and access. Another purpose was to elicit information that would help the participating libraries assess their own readiness to preserve and provide access to their recorded-sound collections. We also hoped that survey findings would help library leaders and funders determine how best to allocate preservation funds and thereby help ensure access to historically important sound recordings. Finally, the survey was designed to raise awareness within the larger research and funding communities of the value of audio collections and to encourage institutions with important audio holdings to seek support for their collections.

Several surveys and reports have documented various aspects of the problem of ensuring access to audio recordings for research and teaching. In designing CLIR's survey of recorded sound, we built on that foundation to explore a broader set of issues that affect the ability of collection managers to expand access to their holdings. Our primary goal was to gather information about recorded sound that is of value for research and teaching. We were particularly interested in collections that include rare or unique recordings, both commercial and noncommercial. Yet, we were aware that such collections make up only a small portion of the entire audio collection held in any library. Consequently, this report contains information about general, as well as special, recorded-sound collections.

Because audio collections in academic libraries are known to have often limited bibliographical access and inventory control, we decided to restrict the survey to two distinct sampling groups: the first a subset of ARL libraries, and the second the entire group of Oberlin libraries. We used the same survey instrument in both cases, but our methods of data gathering differed between the group of large research libraries and the smaller academic libraries found on liberal-arts college campuses.

We engaged the services of David Randal Allen and Karen Allen, of The Communications Office, Inc., to design, conduct, and analyze the survey. An advisory group of nine experts helped vet the design of the survey instrument and analyze the results. Expert staff from more than 80 libraries cooperated in completing a survey of materials that were in most cases not easy to quantify or otherwise describe in traditional survey methods. We are grateful to all of these dedicated professionals who made the survey possible.

# Scope, Design, and Methodology of the Survey

---

## **What Do We Want to Know, and Why?**

The goal of this survey was modest: to collect and analyze baseline information about the status of audio collections held by a set of research institutions. Such information will be valuable for several purposes. First, it can help shape the national preservation plan now being developed by the National Recording Preservation Board (NRPB) and the Library of Congress to preserve “sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant” [Public Law 106-474]. The National Recording Preservation Act of 2000 (NRPA) charges the NRPB to develop a preservation plan that will, among other things, “increase accessibility of sound recordings for educational purposes.” The plan will be based on a study being conducted by the board that will provide a broad overview of the current state of audio preservation in the United States. The Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) sees a special need for research institutions to make available detailed information about the state of their rare and historically valuable audio holdings, since these holdings would be among the most important to preserve under a national plan. Unlike the commercial companies that recorded the great performances of the twentieth century, research institutions have a preservation mission. When academic libraries acquire such commercially published materials, they usually retain and preserve them over the decades; commercial recording companies, by contrast, may not.

The findings of CLIR's survey can also help managers and decision makers in research institutions develop local plans for audio preservation and access. Having information about their own holdings relative to those of peer institutions will help these leaders assess their institutional readiness to address the challenges presented

by audio holdings in relation to peer institutions, to identify what problems they share, and to develop strategies in concert with others to address common problems.

Organizations that fund audio preservation and access, from the administration within research institutions to the philanthropic foundations, state humanities centers, and federal agencies that commit funds to expanding access to audio, will also find the information from this survey helpful. Once funds are appropriated, the National Recording Preservation Foundation (NRPF) will join that group of donors. The NRPF was authorized by the NRPA to make matching federal grants to institutions to preserve their collections. Professional associations may also be a source of funding. For example, the American Folklore Society, Audio Engineering Society, Association of Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC), Association of Research Libraries (ARL), and others may commit membership funds to projects their members consider timely. An understanding of the state of audio in various collecting institutions and the barriers to ready access should help funding agencies decide which investments in access, preservation, or rights issues would be the most strategic and fruitful at this stage.

### **Why a Survey?**

When CLIR decided to gather information by which to benchmark the current state of audio collections in a key set of repositories, it had few well-researched sources to consult. Many experts, however, offered anecdotal evidence that, if aggregated, would provide a solid basis of information and indication of trends.

Anecdotal evidence about the state of audio collections abounds. It points to such problems as insufficient bibliographical control, which impedes both access to and in-house knowledge about the content of the collections (music libraries are one exception to this rule); lack of staff expertise in audio formats and genres; confusion about privacy and intellectual property rights and acceptable practice for fair use in an academic setting; and, above all, limited financial resources. The survey sought to gather evidence that would speak to the validity of these perceptions.

The survey designers sought to gather quantitative information whenever possible. However, audio collections lack the standard descriptive practices that exist for published text collections. Consequently, the data that organizations gather about audio holdings, whether published or unpublished, do not approach the depth, specificity, and uniformity of those available for the published print record. In designing the survey, the challenge was to complement the quantitative data that could be obtained through a structured survey with qualitative information that would allow a nuanced and valid interpretation of those data. Because previous surveys covering some of this territory had produced low response rates, we knew we would also need to conduct interviews with staff at some of the institutions surveyed.

## What Have We Learned from Other Surveys?

### *Lessons learned from a previous survey of original audio recordings*

CLIR is one of several organizations that have tried to establish baseline information about recorded sound. In 2000, CLIR worked with the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress, the American Folklore Society, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities on a program called Folk Heritage Collections in Crisis. Its aim was to identify the problems in preserving folklore collections and inform the development of plans to mitigate those problems. The program coordinators agreed that, given the primitive state of description for most original folklore recordings and the rights issues inherent in the content, any plan to preserve these collections must start by defining and overcoming the access and rights barriers to preservation. The scope of the preservation challenge, in other words, extends beyond the inherent physical limitations resulting from fragile analog (or digital) carriers.

As part of the Folk Heritage Collections in Crisis program, some partners surveyed constituencies believed to have custody of mostly unpublished ethnographic audio collections. These constituencies ranged from libraries and archives to state and local humanities councils and members of academic folklore societies. The goal of the survey was to create a fact-based picture of the state of folklore collections and the infrastructure that supports them.

The survey was valuable in highlighting the many barriers—technological, financial, legal, and institutional—that stand between recordings and the ability to access them, both now and in the future. Unfortunately, it failed to achieve a critical mass of respondents and therefore did not produce enough data to be statistically valid. Instead, the results demonstrated a “functional and intellectual disconnect between those responsible for creating the collections and those charged with caring for them.”<sup>1</sup>

### *Investigation of other audio surveys*

Other surveys of recorded sound collections include the following:

- a report by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS), published in 1998, that focused on key institutional collections held by recording studios and audio archives
- the annual survey by the ARL of library holdings, which include audio collections (but at a high level of generality)
- the Heritage Health Index, a pending survey of audio and other media in cultural heritage institutions soon to get under way

More information about these and related surveys, including conclusions drawn from the surveys as a whole, is provided in Appendix 1.

Although these surveys asked questions about the content of audio holdings, their bibliographical status, their state of preserva-

---

<sup>1</sup> Council on Library and Information Resources. 2001. *Folk Heritage Collections in Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources. Page 60.

tion, and so forth, none attempted to look at the entire suite of issues that might be considered crucial to management. Such issues include staffing and resources, the level of expertise available on rights issues, and the establishment of institutional policies on these and other aspects of recordings.

### **Why This Survey?**

In developing our survey instrument, we tried to determine what information managers would find most important when making decisions about funding and policies for their audio collections. In preliminary discussions, some of these managers cautioned us that their staffs are asked many times a year to participate in surveys led by various worthy bodies. A key incentive for these staff to supply data—which are often difficult to assemble—would be the opportunity to see aggregate data from other similar institutions. That aggregation, the managers noted, would create a preservation landscape in which individual institutions could place themselves. Although direct comparisons would rarely be possible, aggregation would enable the managers to identify patterns of problems and to determine where collective action may provide leverage on some key problems, such as descriptive standards or reformatting strategies.

To avoid the possibility that our survey would yield insufficient quantitative data to create a nuanced picture of the state of audio collections and of challenges to their preservation and access, we decided to develop a set of qualitative queries in those areas where quantitative and comparative data might not be available. During our pilot testing of the surveys, we encountered enough responses in the order of “unanswerable” and “it depends” from larger libraries that need for a dual approach—qualitative as well as quantitative—became quite evident. We found that respondents were willing, even eager, to provide qualitative answers.

### **Why Survey Academic Libraries?**

Annual ARL surveys confirm that research libraries have large audio holdings—indeed, some have very large and well-known audio archives. Nonetheless, there is no reason to conclude that libraries hold most of the nation’s preservation-worthy audio collections. Even collections created in the course of university research do not routinely end up in libraries. The creators of ethnographic collections, for example, usually retain possession of them, even when they are no longer mining them for evidence. Many libraries routinely turn down offers of such collections from faculty because the materials are likely to be out of their scope or are not sufficiently described to allow a useful assessment of their research value. (The inconclusive survey conducted by the Folk Heritage Collections in Crisis project supports this evidence.) Moreover, commercial recording companies, historical societies, scientific institutes, symphony orchestras, conservatories, radio stations, and many other organizations that create

audio materials are likely to be the primary holders of their assets (although their commitment to preserve the materials and to provide access to researchers varies greatly).

Surveys by other agencies reveal the extent to which audio collections exist outside of research institutions. For example, state folk arts programs and others are working on inventorying their holdings. The National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS) has done a survey of valuable or endangered published materials found among the professional (studio) holdings.

That said, many libraries have collected audio that is primarily of educational value (i.e., cultural, historical, or aesthetically significant materials). Research libraries have collected rare and unique materials, many acquired through archives of eminent individuals or organizations. Because libraries are more likely than most other repositories to follow common schema for bibliographic control, they should be better positioned than others to assess their collections and to develop appropriate preservation and access strategies.

Many public libraries have large audio reference collections, but reference collections were not within the scope of this study. While certain public libraries have extensive research collections that include rare and significant audio collections (New York Public Library most notably), we chose to focus on campus-based libraries to increase the comparability of the institutions under review. A survey of research audio collections in public libraries would be of great value.

### **Why Survey These Academic Libraries?**

We surveyed two groups of academic libraries—18 research libraries (the ARL group) and 51 Oberlin Group libraries. As these libraries identify themselves, they are comparable in mission, collection scope, and, often, in size. Both groups share assumptions and vocabularies about collection care and management. We had a natural desire to look at libraries with the richest collections. However, to get a sense of the landscape of audio collections across a wider spectrum of academic libraries, we decided not to survey only—or even primarily—libraries well-known for their audio holdings, although some institutions in the two sample groups do hold preeminent audio archives.

### **Who Designed the Survey?**

CLIR engaged The Communications Office, Inc., to design the survey. The firm has extensive experience in survey work, including surveys of libraries and library organizations. The company's principals also have expertise in broadcast media and audio. To assess the survey design, advise on the selection of institutions to be surveyed, and aid in interpreting results, CLIR formed an advisory group comprising a mix of the expertise needed for such a broad-gauged survey. It included library administrators, preservation managers, audio curators, and archivists. A list of advisory group members is provided in the front matter.

## How Was the Survey Conducted?

A pilot survey was conducted among four libraries in July and August 2003, before the two survey groups were identified. Respondents included two ARL institutions, one land-grant institution and one liberal arts college. The results confirmed our hypothesis that large libraries would not be well served by data gathered only through an online survey. Their collections tend to be heterogeneous and dispersed among several administrative units that follow different practices for counting, describing, serving, and so forth. Large libraries also reported difficulties in interpreting key words; even the term "unique" sometimes required clarification. By contrast, the response from the liberal arts college indicated that, even with valuable original collections to report, its staff felt comfortable responding to a Web-based survey instrument.

We refined the survey instrument on the basis of what we learned from the pilot surveys. We eliminated some questions and changed the sequence of the questions. The final survey asked 100 questions (84 objective "yes/no" or multiple-choice questions and 16 open-ended questions) focused on five areas related to sound recordings: access, rights, preservation, funding and resources, and policy. The surveys asked the same questions of both ARL and Oberlin Group libraries. Two survey formats were used: one-on-one interviews were used for ARL, and a Web-based survey form was used for the Oberlin Group libraries. The survey was conducted between September and December 2003.

The Oberlin Group agreed to send the Web-based survey to its 72 member libraries, 51 of which responded. To survey the ARL libraries, we settled on a sample of 22 private and public libraries to interview in-depth by phone; of these, 18 responded. A list of respondent institutions is provided in Appendix 2.

A total of 82 survey data sets were received, including the pilot surveys. The survey group of ARL institutions resulted in 27 survey interviews from the 18 responding libraries (five of the ARL institutions offered as many as three units with sound collections to be surveyed). The survey of Oberlin institutions resulted in 55 electronic responses representing 51 institutions.

All respondents were promised confidentiality of their answers. One exception to this was requested: that examples of collection information useful to the reporting process could be cited with attribution upon permission from the institution concerned.

At ARL institutions, survey questions were given to the library director or head librarian. That individual then assigned responsibility for information gathering to the staff member(s) most able to respond. The survey interviewers established contact with each institution and set up telephone appointments to conduct the surveys. The telephone interviews were recorded and the tapes were transcribed. This provided additional subjective information and facilitated cross-examination of responses.

At Oberlin Group libraries, survey questions were also provided to library directors, who then delegated the task of responding to the Web-based survey to an appropriate individual on their staff. An assistance telephone number and e-mail address were provided on the entrance page to the survey. Several respondents made use of these communication options to ask questions.

## Summary of Findings

---

This section presents a summary and an interpretation of the survey responses. It highlights overall findings, notes similarities and disparities between the ARL and Oberlin Group libraries, and identifies noteworthy results within each study group. The full results are provided in Part 2.

The survey shows that recorded-sound research collections on campuses are rich and diverse, ranging from performances to field recordings and including unique ethnographic and scientific data, spoken word, and rare items of local and national significance. Most campuses report increased demand for the use of audio in teaching and research. But with few exceptions, barriers to such use are high and institutional readiness for improving the condition and accessibility of audio holdings is low, especially for rare and unique materials. The reasons are complex, ranging from a restrictive rights regime that discourages investments in preservation of even the rarest materials to a lack of effective and cost-efficient bibliographical-control schemes that meet the special needs of recorded-sound collections.

While respondents tended to identify lack of funding as the greatest barrier to access, a closer look at the survey results tells a more complicated story. Other commonly cited barriers included the following:

- the absence of appropriate standards and tools for cost-effective inventory and bibliographical control
- the lack of effective and cost-efficient means of treating and reformatting analog originals
- the absence of clear mandates about how to provide access to valuable collections the rights to which are ambiguous or unknown
- the lack of staff who are sufficiently trained and conversant in the genres, formats, and rights issues unique to recorded-sound collections

The scope and extent of these challenges make it clear that merely spending more money on the same approaches will not lower the barriers now facing the users of audio. This is especially true given the short time remaining to rescue some of the most endangered collections. New approaches to intellectual and inventory control, new technologies for audio capture and automatic metadata extraction, new programs of education and training, and more aggressive access policies under the fair use exemption of the copyright law for education are necessary before most of the rare and historically important audio collections on campuses can be taken off the endangered cultural-resources list.

## 1.0 Access

With audio resources, as with other archival collections, there is a delicate balance between supply and demand. If collections are hidden from the view of users because they are undescribed or otherwise hard to find, demand for access will be low. If collections are difficult or expensive to process and stabilize for service, there may be little incentive to make them available, because demand might then increase in ways that would stress the library's resources.

Providing access to audio collections, even bibliographical access, presents greater challenges than does providing access to print or text-based special collections and archival collections. If audio resources are not linked to a written identifier (such as a record jacket or tape label), determining their content can require labor-intensive, real-time "browsing" (that is, listening) and can require specialized playback equipment that is not readily available.

The survey was designed to answer the following questions about access:

- What audio holdings are found in library collections, and what are their strengths?
- What collections are valuable but inaccessible, and why?
- Where on campus besides the library are there significant audio collections, particularly of original or rare materials?
- How do staff members define "significance" and "originality" in audio items?
- Is the demand for access to audio increasing, as anecdotal evidence suggests? If so, what is the nature of the increased demand?
- How ready are libraries to meet the demand?
- How do users find out what audio items libraries have?
- In what formats do users prefer to get access to audio items?

Respondents were able to identify significant original or rare audio collections in nearly all the institutions surveyed. Most respondents also identified original and significant collections held in academic units that were not part of the library. Few respondents claimed to have adequate bibliographical or inventory control over their audio assets. Most claimed that a significant portion of their holdings were "hidden." Nonetheless, and somewhat paradoxically,

nearly all also claimed that the demand for access to audio was growing on their campuses.

Staff identified collection strengths that ranged widely from campus to campus, as one would expect of special collections and archival holdings (question 1.1). These strengths included music, live music performances, and ethnomusicology; historical spoken word, some large and unique, some described as a part of a special collection, some tied to a campus's departmental strengths; oral histories, both of major national figures and of important local and campus figures; recordings of campus events; recordings from campus radio stations; and a variety of audio components of larger special collections.

Asked to name "collections or items of high importance which are currently not accessible, and why" (question 1.2), respondents offered a diverse list, citing specific recordings or collections. In most respects, the categories mapped closely to the responses for question 1.1 on major strengths. Reasons given for inaccessibility were overwhelmingly related to a lack of bibliographic control. Other reasons frequently cited included physical fragility (such as sticky-shed syndrome, which renders tapes unplayable without preparatory treatment) and lack of playback equipment for obsolete formats. Respondents also reported access restrictions imposed by donors and staff concerns about privacy rights. Summarizing the situation at one institution, a respondent said that there is "no, or minimal, bibliographic access because of limited staffing, the receipt of large collections, and the inability of traditional cataloging and methods of archival description to deal with processing very large collections of musical and other sound recordings."

Not all libraries reported accessibility problems. At both Oberlin and ARL libraries some respondents said that "everything is accessible." It is unclear, however, whether such responses reflect a policy ("Everything is accessible to faculty, staff, and students" was one response) or a description of the collections' bibliographical and physical readiness to be served. Among respondents claiming that all audio holdings are accessible were those who, in another section of the survey, reported that large portions of their collections are uncataloged. Others reported that their access policy is to make everything available by doing preservation on demand, but at the same time they reported having obsolete formats (for example, Dictaphone recordings, cylinders, lacquer discs in bad shape) that they are not able to stabilize or transfer to another medium in order to play back. Several Oberlin libraries reported few or no rare audio holdings, and they reported that their collections are fully accessible.

Seventy-eight percent of those who responded to the question "Are you seeing any increased demand for recorded sound in teaching?" (question 1.3b) replied "yes." The evidence that ARL respondents provided in follow-up interviews suggests that the increase comes from interdisciplinary demand, that is, use beyond that generated by music courses. One respondent reported, "We've seen a dramatic increase in the use of music, just as we have of video." Beyond materials in the music library, the recorded-sound holdings kept in

the special collections library “are being used more and more in history classes, in English literature classes, French literature, anthropology, sociology,” and others. In some cases, staff noted not more demand per se, but an increased use of audio assets because Intranet access made them easier to use. One respondent mentioned that the library served about five rare titles a week, but that since putting “a small collection online that got about 17,000 downloads in the first year, perhaps it was more accurate to say that rare materials get 305 uses a week.”

To learn what lay behind any reported increase in the use of audio, we asked how the institutions promote such resources (question 1.3a). Few respondents reported undertaking special promotions of audio holdings. Most said that word was spread through existing catalogs, by word-of-mouth with faculty and students, and through Web sites that advertise their holdings. Several respondents noted the successful use of newsletters and announcements, particularly when reporting new acquisitions.

Answers to questions about the size of collections and how collection items are counted (questions 1.4a, 1.4b, and 1.4c) reflected a lack of uniformity of practice among libraries and the inherent difficulty in assessing the size of unprocessed collections. Oberlin respondents reported smaller collections, from a few hundred items to as many as 50,000 items. Most ARL respondents reported collections of more than 100,000 items, and some reported as many as 200,000 to 350,000 items.

For both groups, counting collection items was a problem. Most respondents said they count by item, not by title (see question 1.4b). Among those who count by item, respondents were divided on their preference for counting a four-disc set as one item versus four items. Concerning duplicates, respondents typically asserted that their preference was for not counting duplicates in collection totals. But when asked whether their estimates for the number of objects of recorded sound in their collections included duplicates, the respondents allowed that some duplicates were necessarily included. One respondent, for example, after further questioning, said that his initial count of total items (about 60,000) would probably be reduced by as many as 10,000 items if duplicates could be identified and excluded.

The survey revealed that collections of potential significance to the college or university are often held outside the library (question 1.5). These range from research and teaching collections in academic departments to records of campus events held in administrative and special-events offices. One university reported that its main visual-resource library, serving a school of art and architecture, includes oral histories of many significant twentieth-century architects, for example. Another university reported that its schools of business, medicine, and law each had significant collections (for example, tapes of trials, lectures, and conferences). It was not clear how these materials were being stored, preserved, and made accessible, if at all. Such collections may be falling through the cracks on many campuses. There was no way to determine whether the answers given to this question

were comprehensive, as there may well be campus collections that are “hidden” even from the library.

To gauge how many collections of preservation-worthy audio there may be in academic libraries (and by implication how ready libraries would be to identify them for funding opportunities), we asked about their rare and unique collections and the bibliographic status of those collections. Respondents were asked to identify percentages of “unique and nonduplicate recorded-sound objects” in specific categories, such as original music masters, field recordings, and so on (question 1.6). Respondents were then asked to place percentages on the bibliographic status of their collections (question 1.7), selecting from six choices: item-level, collection-level, finding aid, accession record, no cataloging or inventory, or other. The response to question 1.6 indicates that commercial recordings make up a large percentage—more than 75% on average—of recorded-sound collections. From there, the numbers drop to less than 25% and include, in descending order, original-music masters; oral history; other spoken word; commercial, but rare, recordings; field recordings; and natural history. Questions 1.6 and 1.7 were clearly difficult for many of the respondents in both survey categories. One responded noted that the given answers were guesses, saying they “do not have statistics.” Another said his institution has “not done serious cataloging since the 1970s. We have what we call ‘a list.’” Yet another noted, “Cataloging is our biggest problem.”

Responses indicated that there are more similarities than differences between the two groups with respect to access questions. Both ARL and Oberlin groups, for example, acknowledged that cataloging is a major obstacle to overcome before preservation and use of rare, nonduplicate recorded-sound objects can move forward. Both groups selected “lack of bibliographic control” as their number-one concern when asked to rate a list of possible barriers that users face (question 1.12). Furthermore, the respondent groups collectively selected “lack of funding” and “lack of staffing” as the two barriers that most often prevent their libraries from having a full inventory of their audio holdings (question 1.8). Respondents cited other barriers, including rights. For example, one respondent said that her institution is “unclear [about] copyright status of recordings . . . of lectures, readings.” Another said that “[providing] a detailed inventory . . . is a low priority.” Another respondent noted a scarcity of the most important resource: time. “Other priorities continually bump cataloging projects,” this individual noted.

Time is a crucial scarcity, given the inherent difficulties presented by audio. With current technologies, the sole method of determining the content of unique or unlabeled recordings is to listen to them. In certain genres, such as oral histories, the amount of time it takes to determine the content can discourage use, because one must often “wade through” lots of tape to find the sections of highest value to the listener.

Respondents were asked how often rare, nonduplicate titles are requested (question 1.11). Answers indicated that requests for these

materials are low, and one may assume there is a direct correlation with preceding answers indicating problems with bibliographic control, numbers of unprocessed collections, and lack of promotion. Seventy-five percent of respondents answering this question said that only 1 to 10 titles are requested per year. ARL respondents reported a higher number of weekly requests than did Oberlin respondents, who overwhelmingly reported that requests could be counted only on an annual basis. Some guesswork was called for, as more than one respondent replied that they do not keep statistics. One respondent put the problem in perspective, saying, "By not cataloging, there is no access if the piece is unprocessed or [has] never been cataloged. The rare, nonduplicate titles are probably the most underreported." But some respondents took issue with what they saw as incorrect assumptions behind the question. They argued that rare or special collection items are not heavily used, regardless of their format, and they expressed concern about making an equation, even implicitly, between demand for use and inherent value.

Barriers facing users were the focus of question 1.12. Respondents said users are impeded by, in descending order, lack of bibliographic control, lack of funding, lack of playback equipment, lack of reference staff, lack of reference copies, intellectual property rights, lack of space, lack of technical expertise, lack of technical staff, and remote storage. Asked to list any other barriers, one respondent said "lack of bibliographic control and concern for preserving originals." Other comments were "deterioration of magnetic tape" and the need for "technical staff to make copies from damaged originals." One respondent offered this analysis of the situation: "Funding would solve everything, so it is number one. Unclear property rights is two, because it does not make sense to catalog anything until we are sure that we will be able to use it. So, bibliographic control is logically three. We often have trouble finding a place to sit, so I decided that lack of space should be a four."

Question 1.13 asked respondents to identify their users. "Undergraduates" was the largest group of users, identified at 60% to 80% (by 27% of the respondents). All other categories were identified at less than 20% of their users. In descending order, respondents reported public (53% of respondents), faculty (46%), visiting scholars (45%), graduates (40%), alumni (40%), and media/corporate (37%).

Question 1.14 asked how libraries make recorded-sound objects available. Such objects were available, in descending order, on analog media (80% of respondents), on CD-R (53%), on CD-ROM (32%), on the Internet (31%), on an Intranet (29%), and on DVD (27%). One respondent noted making copies to digital audiotape. Four respondents mentioned use of electronic reserves.

## 2.0 Rights

The laws governing copyright of recorded sound differ in significant ways from those governing published sheet music, books, journals, and other print-based collections. The primary difference is that

federal copyright statutes did not protect recordings until 1972. All sound recorded before that year is protected by state code or common law. When the older recordings became covered by federal law, they automatically gained many additional years of copyright protection. As a result, most audio, even that recorded before 1923, is under copyright protection until well into the second half of the present century. In addition, audio items usually comprise a complex bundle of rights, many of them so-called underlying rights that adhere to performers, composers, and distributors and that are difficult to untangle and trace for purposes of clearance.

Although the right to preserve and the right to make accessible are legally distinct, preservation reformatting is so labor-intensive that it makes sense for institutions to do it only if access is foreseen in the near term. Because digital output is the preferred medium for preservation reformatting, some digital distribution rights are therefore necessary to provide incentives for preservation investment. In the academic setting, that means distribution for fair use.

Despite its brevity, this section of the survey took a disproportionate amount of time to formulate. Because the subject of rights is so charged, it was important to phrase questions in a way that would ensure that respondents would feel comfortable answering truthfully. We were interested in determining how perceptions of rights influence decisions about preservation and access. Whether or not respondents' perceptions about copyright and privacy rights were correct was beyond the scope of the survey and, to a large degree, irrelevant. Our goal was to find out whether the uncertainty widely reported in the library community about preservation and access is having a deleterious effect on libraries' core missions of preservation and access for educational purposes.

In framing questions about the rights to preserve and provide access to audio collections, our primary interest was to determine

- levels of understanding of the law for sound recordings
- to what extent perceptions about rights influence decisions about preserving recorded sound
- to what extent perceptions about rights influence decisions about making sound recordings accessible

In answering question 2.1, which focused on challenges relating to rights and compliance, few respondents expressed confusion about their right to preserve materials. Eighty-six percent said they had no challenges with legal compliance with respect to preserving unpublished holdings, and 75% reported no challenge with respect to commercial recordings. A small majority replied that they had no challenges with respect to the privacy rights of oral history subjects (64%), no challenges with respect to offering access to commercial recordings (52%), and no confusion about their rights to offer access to unpublished recordings (64%). Nonetheless, many interviewees reported confusion about what the law provides for, and this confusion was sufficiently widespread to give one pause about what these responses really mean. One respondent reported that "lack of clarity

of copyright law is the biggest issue.” Another said that “in many cases, determining copyright holders of particular sound recordings is not possible with our current resources.” Some respondents, however, expressed no special concern, asserting an understanding of their rights and how fair use can be claimed in an academic environment. “There are no challenges [with legal compliance] based on our understanding of fair use,” said one.

Some of the consternation expressed about the lack of clarity regarding both privacy and intellectual property rights was reflected in the answers to question 2.2, “Estimate the percentage of your recorded-sound collections that includes documentation that could be useful in sorting out ownership of copyright issues.” The largest percentage of respondents answering this question reported that less than 20% of their collections had such documentation.

Concerning posting audio materials on the Internet (question 2.3), 69% of the respondents reported that they are confident they have obtained all necessary permissions or clearances. Half of the respondents indicated that they sought legal consultation before posting audio materials on the Internet.

### 3.0 Preservation

Given that many audio collections are under the direct supervision of people who are not trained primarily as recorded-sound curators or as audio engineers, we wanted to learn how prepared those collection stewards were to identify historically valuable audio holdings and make a compelling case for their preservation. We also wanted to determine whether they were following best practices for the preservation and service of fragile items.

In the section on preservation, we asked respondents to identify

- what makes audio preservation-worthy
- what percentage of their collections they identify belonging to that category
- what actions libraries have taken to preserve their audio holdings
- how many libraries follow what is viewed as best practice, i.e., the creation of duplication masters and listening copies for analog materials

Both ARL and Oberlin libraries identified the same features that make audio worthy of preservation (question 3.1). The features cited were, in descending order of frequency, uniqueness or rarity, historic value, significance of content for research and teaching, format and condition of the original, significance of the performer or performance, aesthetic documentation or value, and local or regional value.

Question 3.2 asked respondents to estimate the percentage of their preservation-worthy sound recordings that are (a) original or master recordings and (b) rare commercial recordings. With respect to original or master recordings, the highest number, or 28% of the respondents, estimated that less than 20% fall into such a category. Concerning rare commercial recordings, the highest number of

respondents, or 48%, likewise said that less than 20% of their preservation-worthy sound recordings fall into this category. Forty-five percent of the respondents answering question 3.3 said less than 20% of their preservation-worthy sound had been copied to duplication masters. Half of the respondents answering this question said that less than 20% of their preservation-worthy holdings had been copied to listening copies.

Concerning accessibility of preservation-worthy sound (question 3.4), 42% of the respondents said that 80% to 100% of their preservation-worthy sound is accessible. Asked what percentage of their preservation-worthy holdings do not have listening copies but were available for use (that is, in the original, question 3.5), 71% of respondents said that very few items (less than 20 percent) were not served. The lack of appropriate playback equipment (question 3.6) was not a barrier to access. Eighty-one percent of respondents reported that less than 20% of their collections were inaccessible because they lack the equipment to play them.

Question 3.7 asked whether respondents had undertaken a recorded-sound preservation project in the past five years and, if so, for what reason. All ARL libraries answered, and most reported that they had undertaken such projects. Some ARL libraries described specific projects for which they had secured special funding; others explained that their policy is to do preservation on demand and thus that activities are ongoing. One respondent noted that his institution's digitization program "is viewed more as a service to the school of music and faculty and students, but it is indeed preservation."

Specific preservation projects cited by respondents included rerecording Edison recordings, outfitting a conservation laboratory that will include digital audio equipment, preserving deteriorating recordings of an important music festival, reformatting open-reel tapes, transferring cylinder recordings to other formats, processing tapes with sticky-shed syndrome, reformatting spoken-word poetry LPs, reformatting 1,000 hours of Eisenhower-era political histories, surveying the state of an audio collection to provide a foundation for future preservation work and grant applications, processing collections of 2,000 theatrical transcription disks and placing them in acid-free containers, and creating duplicate cassettes and reel-to-reel copies of original cassette recordings of unique theater personnel interviews.

Of the 19 Oberlin group libraries responding to this question, only 6 replied that they had undertaken a recorded-sound preservation project in the past five years.

#### 4.0 Funding and Resources

The following questions were asked about funding and the other resources required to preserve recorded sound and make it accessible:

- How much staff time (i.e., full-time employees [FTEs]) is available for audio collection activities?
- What type of expertise is available?

- What is the budget for preservation and access?
- What are the funding sources for audio-related expenditures?

At all but a few ARL institutions, staffing for recorded-sound collections is minimal, with few full-time positions cited by respondents (question 4.1). Even curator positions, when averaged among respondents answering this question, came to 0.9 FTE. The only position average to exceed 1.0 was that of student staff.

Funding for preservation of and access to recorded sound (question 4.4) differed greatly between the two survey groups. ARL respondents reported average annual spending of \$51,600 per institution, whereas Oberlin respondents reported average annual spending of only \$1,500 per institution. These answers seem predictable, in view of the relative size of library budgets and reports about the size and rarity of audio holdings in the two library types. However, it is hard to draw any meaningful conclusion about differences in spending because of the various ways in which funds for these kinds of activities are allocated and reported.

Only a few institutions appear to formally budget for their sound collections. Most work from grant money or allocate a portion of employees' time. Of all respondents, only three ARL institutions reported that sound recordings were given a line item in formal budgets (question 4.2). Thus, the annual spending numbers (from question 4.4) may be even lower than stated.

## 5.0 Policy

Listing 10 common policies considered useful for managing collections of recorded sound, the survey asked respondents to indicate whether or not their institutions have written policies for any of these policies. Eighty percent of those responding to this question said they do not have a written policy concerning the preservation of recorded sound, while 72% said that they have one for bibliographical control; 69% have collection-development plans for recordings; and 80% have policies for disaster preparedness or recovery. Some commented that policies "vary from unit to unit" or that "general policies of the library apply." One respondent said, "Anything not covered by a written policy is covered by a blanket policy."

## Conclusions

---

Providing easy access to audio in its analog form has always been a challenge. Recorded sound depends on playback equipment for access, and the rapid development and obsolescence of recording formats and playback equipment have resulted in an unending progression of recorded sound that is stranded on superseded media. It takes significant resources—time, money, and technical and curatorial expertise—to transfer recorded-sound content from obsolete and decaying formats onto newer ones.

Perhaps for this reason, audio has taken a backseat in the research and teaching resources that academic libraries routinely provide to their users, despite its undisputed value in archives and libraries. In this sense, audio is similar to the other media collections, such as moving and still images, that constitute a primary source of information for specific disciplines (for example, still images for art history, moving images for film studies, and recorded sound for music, folklore, and ethnomusicology) but that are seldom used in other fields.

Digital delivery of information is changing all that. The same infrastructure that maintains and delivers digital text objects maintains and delivers audio and visual digital objects. So, it is the same servers that keep bits, the same computers that deliver content, and the same licensing regimes that regulate distribution of commercially available materials. This common infrastructure will inevitably erode any distinctions between media that are currently defined by mode of access. As has been the case with other special collections that receive little use while in analog formats, demand for audio has been shown to increase dramatically once it becomes available digitally. This spike in use of “rare” and “special” collections has been amply demonstrated by the Library of Congress’s American Memory site, which offers millions of digitized special collections items free over the Internet.

Before drawing any conclusions from CLIR's survey of audio collections, it is important to bear at least two considerations in mind. First, one must recall the survey respondent who mentioned that his library serves only about five rare titles a week in the reading room but delivers 300 downloads of rare titles in that same period. This instance is more indicative than representative, because few other libraries surveyed reported putting rare materials online. It does, however, point to a strong correlation between easy access and increased use—a correlation that we have seen time and again when other rare collections have been put online. In the digital realm, where ready access drives demand for use, putting more audio online must be one of the core strategies to drive the demand for preservation.

Second, the amount and type of quantitative information that we could glean were limited by the lack of common metrics for measuring various aspects of audio collections. Even determining what academic institutions have, how many items they hold, and how those items are used has proved difficult.

That said, possible implications of the survey results for various sectors of the educational and cultural communities—campus-specific, national, and professional—are summarized in the paragraphs that follow.

### **Campus-Specific Policies**

Academic libraries, dedicated to the education of students and to research in the humanities and sciences, have a unique role in American society. Along with archives and museums, they are positioned to develop, protect, and extend the reach of research and cultural resources that constitute a public good. That is why they have a special role to play in preserving and making accessible the audio heritage of the past. Given how little is known about what audio exists, and where, on campuses, the most important thing that these libraries can do is to undertake campus-wide audits of recorded sound. They might start with what is in their libraries, but they should not stop there. Knowing what audio recordings—from musical performances and oral histories to historic speeches and linguistic tapes—are held on a campus, and where they are located, would allow an academic administration to undertake a risk analysis of these information assets and to develop a strategy for preservation of and access to sound holdings that are critical to their research and teaching missions.

It would then be important to put such maps of local resources side by side with those from other institutions and to develop plans to act collaboratively—or at least in complementary ways—to preserve and make accessible locally held collections. Our advisory group cautioned that while many of the most significant audio collections have been developed outside the teaching needs of faculty (or the research needs of current faculty), use-driven preservation is an effective strategy for selection at this early stage of action. In addition, it is important to pay special attention to those materials most likely to be unique.

## National Policies

A survey of rare and significant audio held in private hands is especially important, because of its wealth. While the ARSC does gather information annually on the collecting interests of its members, it does not attempt to survey what is in private hands per se. One of this project's advisors believes that private collectors purchase much of the rare audio that goes to auction every year; he has observed that a large percentage of pre-World War II rare materials on CD reissues appear to be from private collections.<sup>2</sup>

Another need that is best addressed at the national level is for the development of tools that would automate key activities in preservation that are currently performed manually and thus are highly resource-intensive. Two salient needs have emerged. One is the need for techniques for noncontact extraction of sound from audio carriers;<sup>3</sup> the other is for automated metadata extraction from sound that has been digitized.

Perhaps the highest priority on the national agenda is the need to harmonize the monopoly rights of copyright owners over audio content with the public good of preserving recorded sound for its eventual passage into the public domain. Many people in the library field are uncertain about laws covering access in the digital realm. They seem to be waiting for case law to clarify what is permissible. The trend so far has been to move digital content out of the realm of copyright and into the realm of licensing, so that there is unlikely to be a body of case law to inform policy. Moreover, even where the law might apply, libraries and archives are generally not eager to establish legal precedents in the area of copyright. What is needed is not simply a clarification of the existing law but an ongoing assertion by libraries of fair use for educational ends. Without the constant assertion of fair use, it is likely that a marketplace will eventually grow up to meet the increasing demand for audio, thereby rendering the notion of fair use invalid, even on campuses. As one member of the advisory group noted, it is better for librarians to beg forgiveness than to seek permission.

Others are taking actions to clarify and improve the law as it influences access to the audio heritage. The National Recording Preservation Act calls upon the NRPB and the Library of Congress to study how current laws affect access to audio for educational purposes and to recommend changes to the law when it is found to have deleterious effects on access. That study is currently under way. An important issue to be addressed is how to enable libraries to share digital audio files so that rare materials can be more accessible. This is essential for a cost-effective means of preservation to be scaled across a network of preserving institutions.

---

<sup>2</sup> David Seubert, private communication, May 13, 2004.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, the work undertaken at the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab to develop noncontact methods of recovering mechanically recorded sound at <http://www-cdf.lbl.gov/~av>.

## Professional Issues

Responses to the CLIR survey indicate a wide variety of staff expertise at the institutions surveyed. Libraries with large audio collections, often housed both in the main library and in special archives dedicated to spoken word or traditional music, tend to have one or more staff highly qualified as audio curators. Few, if any, college libraries have such staff. Only five colleges reported having full-time audio engineering expertise available. This situation corresponds to that found in library schools, where only two or three North American library and information postgraduate education programs offer some form of training on audio archiving and preservation in any given year. Library staff have few opportunities to undergo training in the field. Several members of the advisory group recommended developing for audio the kinds of internships that are now common for conservators. These internships should be located in institutions with strong audio expertise.

Respondents also concurred on the need to enumerate the core skills that are necessary in both audio curatorial and audio preservation-engineering practices. Preservation audio engineers are needed in academic libraries with important collections because very few vendors to whom preservation work is currently outsourced are in the business of preserving antique formats. Most of them are production and restoration engineers and are not trained to perform much of the work needed in archival preservation. The development of regional audio-preservation facilities that could serve many libraries and archives, modeled on the facilities that now serve paper and photographic collections, would also serve a need that cannot be met locally.

Audio archiving is a field of cultural- and information-resource management that is far from mature. This is perhaps the root cause of the lack of standards and standardized ways of describing, counting, processing, and providing access to both published and unpublished audio. There is as yet in audio nothing comparable to the professional association in the moving-image community, the Association of Moving Image Archivists, which is often seen as the force behind the rapid growth of the moving-image archival profession. Such a natural coalition of professionals is likely to emerge as those engaged in audio and currently clustered in various professional organizations such as the American Library Association, the Society of American Archivists, and ARSC organize themselves to take on various pressing problems. The list of issues confronting them is a long one. We hope that this survey will help them identify opportunities for action and cooperation.

# PART 2

by David Randal Allen and Karen Allen

## Extended Results of the Surveys

### Combining Answers from the Two Survey Groups

---

- Aggregate respondent total from surveys = 82
- Summary includes data received from pilot participants
- Surveys = 2 (27 ARL group interviews; 55 Oberlin group electronic responses)
- Institutions represented = 69 (18 ARL; 51 Oberlin)
- Institutions submitting multiple responses = 7 (5 ARL; 2 Oberlin)

*Percentages cited represent the portion of the respondent groups answering individual questions. While the percentage represents an aggregate of both respondent groups, all respondents did not answer all questions all of the time.*

*Please note: Respondent answers to open-ended questions have been edited for clarity. Grammar and punctuation errors made by the respondents have not necessarily been corrected.*

#### 1.0 ACCESS

##### [1.1] What are the major strengths of your recorded sound holdings? (open-ended question)

58 respondents (27 ARL; 31 Oberlin)

*[N.B., Redundant responses have been excluded from the list below; numbers **do not** represent coding for the respondent institutions.]*

##### **ARL Responses:**

1. Classical music, ethnomusicology selections, lectures and speeches, performances by faculty, students and guest artists at music school from 1945 forward.
2. The archives of the Ad Council; Carl Sandburg audio recordings (including some instantaneous discs he produced); campus events and other recordings including the radio station; oral histories.
3. Music, foreign language lab, anthropology, ancient Near East, Oriental Institute.
4. Western music, popular culture, jazz, oral history, holdings of local interest.

5. Early popular music; jazz; classical; many cylinders; Latin 45s; opera; voices and speeches.
6. Classical music, political science and cultural events, psychology, performing arts. The collections include 78s and cylinders to CDs and other digital formats.
7. Western music, jazz, theatre, history, language.
8. Recorded sound [holdings] are eclectic by design, including music, politics, labor, popular culture, sports, World War Two era broadcasting, journalism, and lots of voices, oral histories.
9. Post-1950 concert jazz, other music, performance arts, labor and politics oral histories, speeches, and events.
10. Speeches on public policy given at the Commonwealth Club of California meetings, 1944 to the present. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty broadcast archive, circa 1951 to present. Smaller audio collections in primarily textual collections documenting political, social, and economic change in the 20th and 21st centuries; including pre-presidential radio addresses of Ronald Reagan, Ella Wolfe oral histories, speeches and lectures of Sir Karl Popper, etc.
11. Classical vocal and instrumental music collection to support research and teaching. Collection broadened to include American popular and jazz music performances, and a variety of other genres, and spoken word recordings, on a variety of formats from cylinders to CD, magnetic and digital tape, commercially and privately produced.
12. American poetry, history of science and technology in Silicon Valley, Mexican American history, and world government development (UN proceedings).
13. Music, spoken word, poetry readings, congressional papers collections (including sound recordings), speeches, lectures, drama (including sound effects), Native peoples' folklore and language recordings.
14. Linguistics collections such as cylinder collection of Northwest Indians, Jewish story, Poetry, Drama, including sound effects.
15. Unique spoken word; US political history; Politics of New York City; African American History; Yiddish Language; American dialects; poetry.
16. Houston and Austin Symphonies, Radio Dramas from the 1940's to mid 1960's, off air recordings of New Orleans Radio Opera programs and NBC Radio Metropolitan Opera programs, Ross Russell's Dial Records Bebop collection, Texas and Southwestern music, Radio Programs broadcast throughout the Southwest from the 60s, 70s, and 80s including programs on the Mexican American experience and Latin American news; collection of 1960s to date folklore (music and spoken word) relating to Texas, Operas performed in Dallas and Fort Worth, musicals and concerts performed by the Dallas and Fort Worth symphonies.
17. Politics and government, music and oral histories
18. Social protest items and poetry readings of writers.
19. Western classical music, ethnographic music (East Asian genres), film and musical theatre, soundtracks, traditional and popular music.
20. Yiddish language, Judaica, oral histories.
21. Western classical music, American popular music, unique spoken word, US political history (New Deal, World Wars, Vietnam); New York City politics; journalism; philanthropy; arts; international relations and history (China, Middle East, Latin America, Africa); woman's history; African American History; legal history; history of science and medicine; Yiddish language; American dialects; recordings of poetry and authors.
22. Classical Music; Contemporary Art and Music from Nordic Countries; Polar expeditions studies (Admiral Richard E. Byrd Expeditions radio transcriptions disks, etc.). Cartoon research recordings (oral histories, Festival of Cartoon Art presentations), Literary recordings (James Thurber, William S. Burroughs), Theater research recordings.
23. West European Classics; World Music; Jazz; American Music Theatre; Stage Plays; Poetry.
24. Oral histories, National Labor Relations Board, union leaders and members; union conventions and labor leaders' speeches; labor music; almost exclusively 20th C.

25. Radio broadcasts, political and feminist; university collections, including lectures and interviews; oral histories; individual collections (e.g., Joyce Brothers).
26. Jazz, popular music, vintage radio programs, rock 'n' roll, blues, country and opera.

**Oberlin responses:**

27. Traditional Western music of the 20th century, World music collection with emphasis on the music of African cultures.
28. New classical music, jazz, ethnomusicology collections.
29. Jazz, classical, romantic period, and American folk recordings. Also small collection of recordings to compliment courses on 'The Mass' and 'Brahms', as well as course on 'Conducting'. LP recordings by women folk and early rock singers.
30. Early music, Baroque, classical, Romantic, 20th-21st century music, jazz, world music, popular music.
31. Western art music, Native American music, Asian music, Jazz, Quaker history.
32. Ethnomusicology, jazz, classical music.
33. Documentation of American popular music ca. 1900-1940 (Paul Whiteman Collection) oral histories of college personnel and area residents covering the history of higher education and our local area.
34. Folklore and folk music Literature Economics International and Domestic Political Science Religion College history.
35. Western classical music jazz audio books rhythm and blues African music.
36. Folk music American literature Lectures by significant religious, cultural and political figures.
37. Classical music, modern music, world music, jazz and popular music. Voice recordings of eminent literary and political figures.
38. Classical music, western European art music, jazz, contemporary music.
39. Standard Western classical repertory; Jazz; range of musical genres by serious contemporary composers, American composers.
40. Early music; Keyboard music.
41. No particular major strengths; uneven collection based on the selection of materials by faculty at a small college.
42. Literature; Sewanee History.

**[1.2] Name up to five recorded sound collections or individual items of high importance in your library which are currently not accessible and why they are not accessible. (open-ended question)**

54 respondents (27 ARL; 27 Oberlin)

[N.B., Redundant responses deleted; numbers do not represent coding for respondent institutions.]

**ARL Responses:**

1. [UNIVERSITY] performances; musicals from [UNIVERSITY] private collectors not accessioned yet; over 12,000 operas; early music archive; ethnomusicology archive; also collection of [musical performer and composer] recordings.
2. [American poet] material on obsolete formats; [non-profit organization] archives—although everything is there and physically accessible—in some cases we may not have the equipment to play back.... Some of the material is getting fragile... The collections cited would be 'media obsolescent.'
3. [Jazz Collection] from 20s and 30s; Field recordings on Edison cylinders - no machine; chamber

- music/new music – uncatalogued; [Jazz Collection] on videotape; and [folk songs] from 1974 to 1985 - ownership issues.
4. [popular American] music (not accessible); [a Jazz Collection] (not processed, not catalogued); Oral history collections (accessible only via written transcripts).
  5. Cylinders, wax especially, is in need of a grant to preserve. Also have some tinfoil items in need of preservation.
  6. [UNIVERSITY] does preservation on demand, thus most everything is accessible. The [academic center] includes recordings from the 50s - 80s; symphony orchestra recordings - no preservation masters; collection of early 78s and wax recordings.
  7. Entire collection of [spoken word]; [UNIVERSITY] Poetry Collection; Opera; concerts; musical theatre; [jazz musician]; and, collection of dictating machine belts of [major political figure] dictating memoirs.
  8. Everything is accessible. Items on exotic formats need cataloging: news broadcasts from the 70s and 80s on 7-inch reels of magnetic tape; collection on glass discs. Cataloging is our biggest problem.
  9. Oral history of the American Left; Labor songs on tape; concert music.
  10. Audio [broadcast] archive not yet processed; ... large in size, with increments still being received, processing ongoing.
  11. [Collections] have no or minimal bibliographic access because of limited staffing, the receipt of large collections, and the inability of traditional cataloging and methods of archival description to deal with processing very large collections of musical and other sound recordings. Other items: [music festival] tape archives—unplayable due to “Sticky-Shed Syndrome”; [opera performer] Collection—tapes are extremely fragile and should not be played except for preservation purposes; [instrumentalist] Collection of private test pressings—not catalogued and no finding aid is available; Transcription disc recordings [of radio broadcasts] are not catalogued; 78 rpm and LP collections are not catalogued.
  12. [NAME] papers—access restricted pending processing; [political activist] papers—access is restricted pending preservation reformatting; [national council] records—large size has impeded efforts to make accessible to researchers; [designer and futurist] collection—reformatting of this collection has begun but size of the collection means much of is still closed to researchers; [international organization] Audio Collection of 35,000 transcription tapes—size of this collection and the projected costs of preservation digitization have impeded efforts to make this collection accessible.
  13. While all recorded sound is accessible, some items require more time to serve than others due to their condition. Some of these collections include holdings from the [center for native languages]; [NAME] Poetry collection.
  14. All collections are accessible, some more easily than others, due to the need to process some items before handing them to users. This is due to some deterioration (especially sticky-shed among magnetic tape holdings).
  15. All collections are accessible—some more easily than others depending on their condition.
  16. Radio Drama series, oral histories with Texas themes, Mexico Folklore collection, and a collections of recordings featuring [mystery writer], [pop artist], and others located in the [UNIVERSITY]’s humanities center.
  17. Oral histories, language recordings in Yiddish, materials are generally less well controlled and usually scattered within collections of other media.
  18. First, is [historical figure] oral history - originals are fragile 2) [historical figure] oral history - no bibliographic control 3) [civil rights organization] - fragile, no bibliographic control 4) political oral histories in general - ca 4000 fragile recordings 5) popular arts oral histories in general - fragile early cassette format 6) [UNIVERSITY] Opera workshops - no bib control, no equipment to play outdated format.

19. One is Classical Music.... Not accessible because there are first generation (original) formats only. 2) [UNIVERSITY] history. These are accessible. 3) Polar studies (expedition transcription disks) these are accessible. 4) Literary recordings Levels of cataloging are not extensive. 5) Theatre research recordings. Levels of cataloging are not extensive.
20. Various field recordings; Indian Music (field recordings); new music; Judaica Collections; [poetry and spoken word].
21. [union oral histories] - tape degradation; [labor leaders] - tape degradation; [national labor organizations] - permissions.
22. [broadcast shows and news]; [UNIVERSITY] Public Affairs Education Program; Alumni University Lectures; [UNIVERSITY] President interviews around [student unrest]; [1960s activists] project.
23. Oral history recordings of World War II experiences, the home-front during WWII in [NAME] County, and student life.

**Oberlin responses:**

24. Oral history documenting the college, World War II experiences on the home front, and student life. There are interesting only to this community providing an oral record of the institution.
25. Everything in our collection is accessible to members of the faculty, staff, and students.
26. We don't carry any rare sound collections. None of our recordings are available to off campus users because of damage and theft.
27. All holdings are currently accessible.
28. Alumni Oral History; [NAME] Lectures; Public Affairs Symposiums.
29. Gift of Broadway musicals would be invaluable for voice instructors; but the collection remains uncatalogued; 2) gift from a former professor, his entire LP collection, also remains in storage until we can catalog each title.
30. Portion of LP collection resides in off-site Depository; Gift (17,000 LPs) is accessible through the inventory list only.
31. [NAME] Collection of Recorded Jazz.
32. All of our sound collection is accessible.
33. Almost everything is fully cataloged. However, the original, archival recordings of all the on-campus concerts, and most of these items are not currently cataloged at all. Also, do not currently loan any of materials through interlibrary loan.
34. [NAME] radio transcription discs: need to be re-inventoried and re-transferred (older transfer project was not done well); wax cylinder collection—not reformatted, nor has availability through another institution or reprint recordings been researched; earlier oral history projects—no releases gathered at the time, nor were transcripts, use copies or dup. masters made.
35. Everything is accessible.
36. [NAME] ballad collection; [NAME] folk music collection; [NAME] writers school and conference; [NAME] Center lecture archives.
37. College music ensemble 78's and 33 1/3 LPs—not cataloged; college historian talks—reel/reel, not cataloged, format not usable.
38. Recordings of informal discussion between students and [civil rights leaders] (2 tapes)—on large reel-to-reel requires reformatting (preservation and access copies on CD); Senior seminar lectures, 1966-1972, include wide variety of topics and many guest lecturers (ca. 300 tapes)—only bibliographic control is via local database in Special Collections; currently on various size reel-to-reel audiotape - requires reformatting (preservation copies on CD, access copies as needed)
39. Not applicable; all recordings are accessible.
40. College recital/concert recordings - not cataloged yet; Collection of nearly 2000 vinyl jazz recordings - approx. half not cataloged yet.
41. Two audio CDs with copy of [NAME] collection housed in Special Collections—notation of the

sound recordings is buried in the bibliographic information in the catalog record for the item and actually accessing the CDs from the Special Collection area is difficult; approximately 130 spoken word recordings that are not cataloged.

42. [local] history collection.

**[1.3a] How does your library promote the use of recorded sound? (open-ended question)**

55 respondents (27 ARL; 28 Oberlin)

**ARL Respondents**

1. Through [OPAC] and on-line exhibits featuring sound. The sound archives also has a strong community outreach program.
2. Each area does this differently and has different reasons for promoting or not promoting. Archives are not eager for people to come and use all of very old recordings and equipment. Music library and the media center—geared to students—are accessible. Do try to respond to faculty and student requests for classroom or studio assignments.
3. Not much promotion. None outside catalog, inventory lists. Some promotion of the [NAME] collection.
4. On line catalog; bibliography; newsletters.
5. Public web site, digital archives, oral history Web site.
6. Do not promote. The institution has international status. There is also a Web site.
7. There is a Web site for special collections and performing arts; there are liaisons with faculty; and always press releases and publicity for new collections.
8. The library does not promote itself. Scholars, teaching assistants, and professors are aware of what we have.
9. The media come to us to use materials we hold in the [language lab]. We have a Web site, and a brochure. We have theatre and history scholars visiting us regularly to get the ‘nuances’ obtainable from sound unavailable from printed matter. We also have a number of public domain items posted on line.
10. Catalogs mainly. We promote the special collections in general catalogs, newsletters, Web pages.
11. Collection level records for all collections are available. Finding aids with additional information on the recordings are available for many collections via the online state archive. Exhibit ... was on display at the [NAME] pavilion [for 9 months]. A dedicated Web site for the [NAME] collection is available on the Web. More than five hours of [political figure]’s speeches have been published on audiocassettes ... which represents the opening of this audio archive.
12. The [NAME] archive has a Web site and brochures. The [NAME] publication programs produced several recordings from the collection. The staff participates in organizations such as ARSC.
13. Electronic EAD finding aids to sound collections are available over the Web. Faculty outreach through the library’s curatorial staff.
14. With the use of recorded sound increasing, the need for promotion may not be that important. We promote via our Web pages and catalogs and report new holdings when new acquisitions occur.
15. The media center holds more popular matter and is more self-promoting via its Web page and via professors and teaching assistants who speak about the audio holdings. Acquisition lists are provided and word of mouth generally brings interest in the collection thereafter.
16. The music library is self-promoting, considering the extensive music program. New CD acquisitions are promoted on the library Web site; discussion with instructors and word of mouth among students.
17. There is some promotion including lectures and speeches by curators, Web pages, catalogs, otherwise—not much organized promotion. There is more use of CDs around the campus.

18. Through the catalog and finding aids.
19. There is some cataloging by item. Others processed as part of an archives, and merely listed in a finding aid.
20. All students may borrow CDs for at least three days at a time. Otherwise, the library does not need to promote the collection. It promotes itself. Recordings can be browsed in the catalog.
21. Finding aids, item level descriptions.
22. Provides playback equipment. Cataloging availability. Item level and archival finding aids for some collections of unique materials.
23. The library provides playback equipment for standard formats. Most commercial recordings are catalogued. Item level or archival finding aids for some collections of unique materials.
24. Primarily through the library's online public access catalog.
25. One site listings; circulation of materials; also Music Library of Circulating Collections; Curator lectures and speeches; streaming audio for major courses.
26. Described in guides and finding aids; online catalog records in local and national utilities; selected topics noted on the Internet; described in instructional sessions.

**Oberlin responses:**

27. By word of mouth. I am often invited to give guest lectures in a variety of classes where music is pertinent, and encourage members of the class to make use of our collection (Latin American History, French literature, etc.) A small number of new releases are displayed on our new bookshelf.
28. Librarians meet w/ faculty, explain to students how to look up recordings in the catalog
29. Most acquisitions are at the suggestion of particular faculty for their use. All materials are listed in the public catalogue. No special promotion of materials.
30. Our classical collection is housed in a large glass enclosed room visible on the main floor. Our collection is not currently publicized or promoted. However, the project is in the early stages of being list in archival finding aides.
31. We do not actively promote its use. It is a non-circulating collection and serves the needs of the music faculty in their teaching.
32. The recording and score collections moved into the library nine years ago and immediately increased the limited hours of operation from 20 to 84 per week. By virtue of bringing the collection into the library (away from an overcrowded and out of the way location) began to see the foot traffic by non-majors and non-music faculty increase. Within a year of opening the Music Listening Room in the library began to provide a central location to fully catalog and house donations they had received and previously held in office closets and our cataloger makes sure each recording is fully cataloged down to individual tracks in the online catalog. Lastly, address new faculty, demonstrating how to search catalog for recordings they might need in class.
33. Recordings circulate to the College faculty/staff and students. They also circulate in a limited way to [regional] faculty and students. Music electronic reserves are now available through Blackboard course pages. College faculty and students make suggestions for purchase which are fulfilled whenever possible.
34. Have no programs at present to promote use of the collections. The [NAME] Collection was a gift that is in the process of being inventoried and cataloged. Other collections exist primarily to support curricular demand.
35. Through the catalog.
36. Online catalog and streaming audio for reserves.
37. Subject lists full cataloging working directly with faculty Web site.
38. Listening stations with CD/audiocassette players in the library. Professors are encouraged to place audiocassettes on reserve, so students may listen to them in the library. Also have been assisting professors with using sound files in their Blackboard course pages.

39. Online catalog. New acquisitions lists.
40. Web presence. Word-of-mouth. Beginning stages of collaboration between Media Services and Special Collections to develop an audio/visual archive.
41. Library fully catalogs all sound recording and audio books. Audiobooks have been assigned a special subject heading that facilitates collection browsing. Musical cds are cataloged with special pre-stamp descriptors such as Popular, Medieval, Jazz and Ethnomusicology, and shelved by these categories improving user access.
42. Extensive analytics in library catalog; working with faculty in area studies to provide music related to curricula and courses; new acquisition lists and displays.
43. Music library highlights new additions to their collection on their Web page. Have also added a small collection of audiobooks we will promote in our library newsletter.
44. Interest in recorded sound is generated via course requirements in the music and dance departments. Other academic departments also use the collection, as do performers (campus and community). The music librarian writes articles from time to time for campus newsletters to promote use of recordings, and the library brochure describes the collection. Bibliographic instruction provides staff with the opportunity to promote the use of the recordings, too.
45. We promote thoughtful use of information, regardless of format when copyright/use restrictions allow, copies are provided for researchers and classroom use; web site for the [NAME] Collection in the process of developing a searchable database of our oral history transcripts and audio.
46. CD collection is cataloged in our OPAC. The LP collection, actually owned by the Music Department, is searchable from a card catalog in the music library.
47. New acquisitions displays seem to encourage people to browse and check out CD's. New CD lists in the OPAC will help as well. We have seen a significant increase in usage now that our facility has moved from the music building into a far more visible place in the main library.
48. Access is available in the on-line catalog.

**[1.3b] Are you seeing any increased demand for recorded sound in teaching?**

**78% of respondents answering this question said YES**

42 respondents (18 ARL; 24 Oberlin; 40 skipped this question)

**[1.4a] Estimate the number of sound recording objects that are in your collection:**

**59 respondents (26 ARL, 33 Oberlin)**

50,001 or more =	15 respondents (14 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 30%
<b>10,00–50,000 =</b>	<b>19 respondents (8 ARL; 11 Oberlin) 35%</b>
5,000–10,000 =	11 respondents (1 ARL; 10 Oberlin) 17%
1,001–5,000 =	7 respondents (2 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 12%
101–1,000 =	4 respondents (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 2%
1–100 =	3 respondents (3 Oberlin) 4%
	(23 skipped this question)

*Taken separately, the ARL and Oberlin respondents differ widely with the majority of ARL respondents reporting recorded sound collection counts above 100,000 and Oberlin respondents reporting collections of up to 50,000 recorded sound objects.*

**[1.4b] How do you count your collection?**

- a) by titles = 18 respondents (5 ARL; 13 Oberlin) 32%  
**b) by items = 38 respondents (26 ARL; 17 Oberlin) 68%**  
 (24 skipped this question)

*Respondents in both surveys cited lack of cataloguing of their collections as the reason for counting by items.*

**[1.4.c] If you count by items, does a four disc set equal:**

- a) one item? 21 respondents (6 ARL; 15 Oberlin) 44%  
**b) four items? 24 respondents (17 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 54%**  
 c) eight items? 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%  
 (34 skipped this question)

**[1.4d] How do you count duplicates? (open-ended question)**

<b>Duplicates counted in inventory.</b>	<b>28 respondents (12 ARL; 26 Oberlin) 33%</b>
Do not count duplicates.	7 respondents (4 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 12%
Duplicates are eliminated.	4 respondents (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 10%
Do not have duplicates.	3 respondents (3 Oberlin) 4%
Keep separate duplicate inventory.	1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%
Duplicates are dubs of originals.	1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%
Did not answer.	38 respondents (4 ARL; 19 Oberlin) 37%

*Respondents typically indicated their policy preference to be for not counting, or eliminating, duplicates from collection counts. But they indicated this was not always practical, citing lack of cataloguing as the reason duplicates are included in totals.*

**[1.5] Other than your library in what units of your home institutions are sound collections held? (open-ended question)**

Special Collections  
 Archives  
 Music department  
 Music library  
 Academic departments  
 Ethnomusicology department  
 Performing arts center  
 Athletic department  
 Computer research center  
 College radio station  
 Rare books and manuscripts  
 Law library  
 Administrative offices  
 Communications department  
 Media center  
 Off-site depository  
 Museum

**[1.6] Estimate the percentage of your library's unique and non-duplicate recorded sound objects that are:**

a) original music masters

<b>0-25%</b>	<b>35 respondents (15 ARL; 20 Oberlin) 66%</b>
25-50%	2 respondents (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%
50-75%	0 responses
75-100%	0 responses
N/A	16 respondents (11 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 30%

b) field recordings

<b>0-25%</b>	<b>33 respondents (12 ARL; 21 Oberlin) 60%</b>
25-50%	2 respondents (2 Oberlin) 3%
50-75%	0 responses
75-100%	0 responses
N/A	19 respondents (14 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 37%

c) commercial recording

0-25%	9 respondents (6 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 17%
25-50%	3 respondents (3 ARL) 4%
50-75%	12 respondents (4 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 20%
<b>75-100%</b>	<b>21 respondents (6 ARL; 15 Oberlin) 38%</b>
N/A	11 respondents (8 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 21%

d) commercial, but rare

<b>0-25%</b>	<b>35 respondents (16 ARL; 19 Oberlin) 65%</b>
25-50%	3 respondents (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 6%
50-75%	2 respondents (2 ARL) 3%
75-100%	1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%
N/A	13 respondents (7 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 24%

e) oral history

<b>0-25%</b>	<b>35 respondents (11 ARL; 24 Oberlin) 65%</b>
25-50%	3 respondents (3 ARL) 4%
50-75%	0 responses
75-100%	3 respondents (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 6%
N/A	12 respondents (9 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 25%

f) other spoken word

<b>0-25%</b>	<b>36 respondents (11 ARL; 25 Oberlin) 64%</b>
25-50%	3 respondents (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 5%
50-75%	3 respondents (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 5%
75-100%	6 respondents (5 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 11%
N/A	8 respondents (7 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 15%

g) natural history

<b>0-25%</b>	<b>17 respondents (3 ARL; 14 Oberlin) 35%</b>
25-50%	0 responses
50-75%	0 responses
75-100%	0 responses
N/A	30 respondents (20 ARL; 10 Oberlin) 65%

h) other		
<b>0-25%</b>	<b>7 respondents (3 ARL; 4 Oberlin)</b>	<b>22%</b>
25-50%	1 respondent (1 Oberlin)	3%
50-75%	1 respondent (1 Oberlin)	3%
75-100%	0 responses	
N/A	26 respondents (18 ARL; 8 Oberlin)	72%

[1.7] Concerning the bibliographical status of your sound collection, estimate the percentage under:

a) item-level cataloguing		
<b>0-25%</b>	<b>7 respondents (6 ARL; 1 Oberlin)</b>	<b>12%</b>
2-50%	6 respondents (5 ARL; 1 Oberlin)	11%
50-75%	11 respondents (4 ARL; 7 Oberlin)	20%
<b>75-100%</b>	<b>22 respondents (4 ARL; 18 Oberlin)</b>	<b>38%</b>
N/A	10 respondents (7 ARL; 3 Oberlin)	19%
b) collection-level cataloguing		
<b>0-25%</b>	<b>10 respondents (9 ARL; 1 Oberlin)</b>	<b>40%</b>
25-50%	3 respondents (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin)	6%
50-75%	3 respondents (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin)	6%
75-100%	5 respondents (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin)	10%
N/A	19 respondents (9 ARL; 10 Oberlin)	38%
c) finding aid or inventory		
<b>0-25%</b>	<b>25 respondents (12 ARL; 13 Oberlin)</b>	<b>49%</b>
25-50%	3 respondents (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin)	6%
50-75%	7 respondents (5 ARL; 2 Oberlin)	12%
75-100%	3 respondents (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin)	6%
N/A	14 respondents (6 ARL; 8 Oberlin)	27%
d) accession record		
<b>0-25%</b>	<b>15 respondents (5 ARL; 11 Oberlin)</b>	<b>44%</b>
25-50%	0 responses	
50-75%	0 responses	
75-100%	4 respondents (3 ARL; 1 Oberlin)	8%
N/A	28 respondents (16 ARL; 12 Oberlin)	48%
e) no cataloguing or inventory		
<b>0-25%</b>	<b>20 respondents (8 ARL; 12 Oberlin)</b>	<b>41%</b>
25-50%	6 respondents (3 ARL; 3 Oberlin)	12%
50-75%	1 respondent (1 ARL)	2%
75-100%	1 respondent (1 ARL)	2%
N/A	21 respondents (11 ARL; 10 Oberlin)	43%
f) other		
<b>0-25%</b>	<b>2 respondents (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin)</b>	<b>6%</b>
25-50%	0 responses	
50-75%	1 respondent (1 Oberlin)	3%
75-100%	1 respondent (1 Oberlin)	3%
N/A	30 respondents (19 ARL; 11 Oberlin)	88%

**g) If other, please describe (open-ended question)**

“Do not have statistics.”

“Have not done serious cataloguing since the 1970s. We have what we call a list.”

“Cataloging is our biggest problem.”

“Accounting for items varies per collection.”

“Bibliographic control varies...”

“...there are variations in the state of inventory...”

**[1.8] If applicable, what are the barriers that prevent your library from having a full inventory of its audio collection? Please order by significance, most important first.**

a) lack of funding

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| <b>1</b> | <b>21 respondents (18 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 40%</b> |
| 2        | 10 respondents (4 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 20%         |
| 3        | 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%                   |
| 4        | 1 respondent (1 ARL) 2%                       |
| 5        | 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%                   |
| 6        | 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%                   |
| 7        | 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%                   |
| n/a      | 15 respondents (3 ARL; 12 Oberlin) 30%        |

b) lack of staffing

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| <b>1</b> | <b>18 respondents (12 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 34%</b> |
| 2        | 17 respondents (11 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 29%        |
| 3        | 1 respondent (1 ARL) 2%                       |
| 4        | 0 responses                                   |
| 5        | 2 responses (2 Oberlin) 4%                    |
| 6        | 0 responses                                   |
| 7        | 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%                   |
| n/a      | 16 respondents (3 ARL; 13 Oberlin) 29%        |

c) lack of expertise

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| 1        | 0 responses                                |
| 2        | 4 respondents (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 8%        |
| 3        | 3 respondents (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 7%        |
| 4        | 3 respondents (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 6%        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>4 respondents (3 ARL, 1 Oberlin) 9%</b> |
| 6        | 2 respondents (2 Oberlin) 4%               |
| 7        | 0 responses                                |
| n/a      | 30 respondents (14 ARL; 17 Oberlin) 66%    |

d) lack of descriptive standards

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| 1        | 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%                |
| 2        | 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) 2%                |
| 3        | 2 respondents (2 Oberlin) 3%               |
| 4        | 3 respondents (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 8%        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>4 respondents (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 9%</b> |
| 6        | 2 respondents (2 ARL) 3%                   |
| 7        | 0 responses                                |
| n/a      | 34 respondents (17 ARL; 18 Oberlin) 73%    |

- e) lack of equipment
- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| 1        | 3 respondents (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 6%         |
| 2        | 5 respondents (4 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 10%        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>7 respondents (5 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 13%</b> |
| 4        | 5 respondents (4 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 10%        |
| 5        | 2 respondent (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%          |
| 6        | 3 respondents (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 6%         |
| 7        | 0 responses                                 |
| n/a      | 25 respondents (10 ARL; 16 Oberlin) 51%     |
- f) lack of space
- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| 1        | 4 respondents (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 10%         |
| 2        | 2 respondents (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 6%          |
| <b>3</b> | <b>11 respondents (8 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 25%</b> |
| 4        | 6 respondents (3 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 12%         |
| 5        | 0 responses                                  |
| 6        | 1 respondent (1 ARL) 2%                      |
| 7        | 0 responses                                  |
| n/a      | 27 respondents (11 ARL; 17 Oberlin) 45%      |
- g) other
- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| <b>1</b> | <b>4 respondents (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 12%</b> |
| 2        | 1 respondents (1 Oberlin) 3%                |
| 3        | 0 responses                                 |
| 4        | 0 responses                                 |
| 7        | 0 responses                                 |
| 8        | 0 responses                                 |
| 7        | 1 respondent (1 ARL) 3%                     |
| n/a      | 31 respondents (19 ARL; 13 Oberlin) 82%     |
- h) other, please describe:
- 12 respondents (5 ARL; 7 Oberlin)

“Space is a severe problem... making it difficult to respond to requests”

“Unclear [about] copyright status of recordings...of lectures, readings.”

“Collections are newly acquired and [not yet] inventoried...”

“[Providing access to] detailed inventory ... is a low priority.”

“Time. Other priorities continually bump cataloguing projects...”

*[Errata: Upon completion of the pilot, questions 1.9 and 1.10 were moved to the top of the survey (positions 1.3a and 1.3b of this text). Questions were not renumbered in order to track responses from the pilots and two surveys.]*

**[1.11] How often are rare, non-duplicate titles in your recorded sound collections requested?**

<b>1–10 titles</b>	<b>35 respondents (20 ARL; 15 Oberlin) 75%</b>
11–50 titles	8 respondents (2 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 16%
51–100 titles	1 respondents (0 ARL, 1 Oberlin) 2%
101–500 titles	4 respondents (0 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 7%
500+ titles	0 responses

**are requested per:**

week	12 respondents (11 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 24%
month	8 respondents (5 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 16%
year	<b>30 respondents (9 ARL; 21 Oberlin) 60%</b>

**other answer: (open-ended question)**

28 respondents (20 ARL; 8 Oberlin)

"We do not keep statistics..."

"By not cataloguing, there is no access if the piece is unprocessed or never been catalogued. ... the rare, non-duplicate titles are probably the most under-reported."

"There is little knowledge of our unique holdings outside the repository."

"Demand ... is low in part due to low patron expectations and long turn around times to make requested materials available."

"It is rare that we receive requests for rare, non-duplicate materials."

"I have no way of knowing."

"They are never requested."

*ARL libraries report a higher frequency of requests of sound recording objects on a weekly basis versus a yearly frequency of activity among Oberlin respondents.*

**[1.12] If applicable, what barriers to access do your users face? Please number them in order of significance, 1 through 10.**

## a) lack of bibliographic control

<b>1</b>	<b>21 respondents (10 ARL; 11 Oberlin) 47%</b>
2	8 (3 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 15%
3	2 (2 ARL) 5%
4	2 (2 ARL) 5%
5	4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 9%
6	2 (2 Oberlin) 4%
7	2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%
8	0 responses
9	0 responses
10	5 (1 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 11%

## b) lack of playback equipment

<b>1</b>	<b>9 respondents (5 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 28%</b>
2	3 (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 9%
3	5 (2 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 14%
4	3 (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 8%
5	5 (5 Oberlin) 14%
6	2 (2 Oberlin) 4%
7	2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%
8	2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%
9	1 (1 Oberlin) 2%
10	4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 13%

- c) lack of reference staff
- |          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| 1        | 2 respondents (2 Oberlin) 6%    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>7 (5 ARL, 2 Oberlin) 26%</b> |
| 3        | 4 (2 Oberlin) 11%               |
| 4        | 1 (1 ARL) 4%                    |
| 5        | 5 (2 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 16%        |
| 6        | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 12%        |
| 7        | 2 (2 Oberlin) 6%                |
| 8        | 0 responses                     |
| 9        | 2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 6%         |
| 10       | 4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 13%        |
- d) lack of technical staff
- |          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| 1        | 2 respondents (2 Oberlin) 5%    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 16%</b> |
| 3        | 3 (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 10%        |
| 4        | 4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 12%        |
| 5        | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 12%        |
| 6        | 4 (3 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 13%        |
| 7        | 3 (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 8%         |
| 8        | 3 (3 Oberlin) 8%                |
| 9        | 1 (1 ARL) 2%                    |
| 10       | 5 (1 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 14%        |
- e) lack of technical expertise
- |          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| 1        | 2 respondents (2 Oberlin) 5%    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 17%</b> |
| 3        | 1 (1 Oberlin) 2%                |
| 4        | 3 (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 11%        |
| 5        | 2 (2 Oberlin) 5%                |
| 6        | 3 (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 11%        |
| 7        | 2 (2 ARL) 11%                   |
| 8        | 3 (3 Oberlin) 8%                |
| <b>9</b> | <b>4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 17%</b> |
| 10       | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 13%        |
- f) lack of funding
- |          |                                  |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>11 (7 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 35%</b> |
| 2        | 8 (4 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 25%         |
| 3        | 4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 12%         |
| 4        | 2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 6%          |
| 5        | 3 (3 Oberlin) 7%                 |
| 6        | 0 responses                      |
| 7        | 2 (2 Oberlin) 5%                 |
| 8        | 2 (2 Oberlin) 5%                 |
| 9        | 0 responses                      |
| 10       | 2 (2 Oberlin) 5%                 |

- g) lack of reference copies
- |          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| 1        | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 11%        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>7 (5 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 23%</b> |
| 3        | 5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 16%        |
| 4        | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 11%        |
| 5        | 3 (1 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 8%         |
| 6        | 3 (3 Oberlin) 8%                |
| 7        | 1 (1 ARL) 3%                    |
| 8        | 2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 6%         |
| 9        | 1 (1 Oberlin) 3%                |
| 10       | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 11%        |

- h) lack of space
- |          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| 1        | 5 (1 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 15%        |
| 2        | 2 (2 ARL) 8%                    |
| 3        | 4 (4 Oberlin) 11%               |
| 4        | 4 (3 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 14%        |
| 5        | 1 (1 Oberlin) 2%                |
| <b>6</b> | <b>5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 17%</b> |
| 7        | 3 (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 10%        |
| 8        | 0 responses                     |
| 9        | 3 (3 Oberlin) 8%                |
| 10       | 5 (2 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 15%        |

- i) remote storage
- |          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 16%</b> |
| 2        | 5 (2 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 15%        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 16%</b> |
| 4        | 1 (1 Oberlin) 2%                |
| 5        | 2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 6%         |
| 6        | 0 responses                     |
| 7        | 1 (1 Oberlin) 2%                |
| 8        | 2 (2 ARL) 8%                    |
| 9        | 1 (1 Oberlin) 2%                |
| 10       | 11 (3 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 33%       |

- j) intellectual property rights
- |          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| 1        | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 8%         |
| 2        | 6 (2 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 16%        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>7 (4 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 21%</b> |
| 4        | 3 (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 10%        |
| 5        | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 12%        |
| 6        | 2 (2 Oberlin) 5%                |
| 7        | 0 responses                     |
| 8        | 2 (2 ARL) 6%                    |
| 9        | 1 (1 ARL) 3%                    |
| 10       | 7 (2 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 19%        |

k ) other barriers, please describe:

22 respondents (12 ARL; 10 Oberlin)

“Overall response is: Lack of bibliographic control and concern for preserving originals.”

“Funding would solve everything, so it is 1. Unclear property rights is 2 because it does not make sense to catalog anything until we are sure that we will be able to use it, so bibliographic control is logically 3. We often have trouble finding a place to sit so I decided that lack of space should be a 4.”

“There are variations in the state of inventory depending on individual collections...”

“Preservation concerns.”

“Lack of publicity about what we hold.”

“Deterioration of magnetic tape.”

“Need technical staff to make copies from damaged originals.”

“Our collection is in the LP format—few of our patrons have turntables. Therefore, the collection is rarely used.”

**[1.13] In percentages, what is the breakdown of users of your audio collection?**

a) Undergraduates

0-20%	12 (9 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 21%
20-40%	6 (4 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 9%
40-60%	9 (2 ARL; 7 Oberlin) 15%
<b>60-80%</b>	<b>16 (6 ARL; 10 Oberlin) 27%</b>
80-100%	10 (1 ARL; 9 Oberlin) 16%
n/a	6 (5 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 12%

b) Graduates

<b>0-20%</b>	<b>20 (10 ARL; 10 Oberlin) 40%</b>
20-40%	12 (11 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 22%
40-60%	3 (3 ARL) 6%
60-80%	0 responses
80-100%	0 responses
n/a	15 (3 ARL; 12 Oberlin) 32%

c) Faculty

<b>0-20%</b>	<b>26 (12 ARL; 14 Oberlin) 46%</b>
20-40%	13 (7 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 22%
40-60%	10 (2 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 17%
60-80%	2 (2 Oberlin) 3%
80-100%	0 responses
n/a	6 (5 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 12%

d) visiting scholars

<b>0-20%</b>	<b>22 (8 ARL; 14 Oberlin) 45%</b>
20-40%	5 (5 ARL) 10%
40-60%	5 (5 ARL) 10%
60-80%	2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%
80-100%	1 (1 Oberlin) 2%
n/a	14 (7 ARL; 7 Oberlin) 27%

- e) alumni
- |              |                                    |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>0-20%</b> | <b>20 (10 ARL; 10 Oberlin) 40%</b> |
| 20-40%       | 1 (1 ARL) 2%                       |
| 40-60%       | 0 responses                        |
| 60-80%       | 0 responses                        |
| 80-100%      | 0 responses                        |
| n/a          | 25 (15 ARL; 10 Oberlin) 50%        |
- f) public
- |              |                                    |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>0-20%</b> | <b>27 (12 ARL; 15 Oberlin) 53%</b> |
| 20-40%       | 8 (5 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 15%           |
| 40-60%       | 1 (1 ARL) 2%                       |
| 60-80%       | 0 responses                        |
| 80-100%      | 0 responses                        |
| n/a          | 15 (9 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 29%          |
- g) media/corporate
- |              |                                  |
|--------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>0-20%</b> | <b>20 (13 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 3%</b> |
| 20-40%       | 1 (1 ARL) 2%                     |
| 40-60%       | 2 (2 ARL) 4%                     |
| 60-80%       | 0 responses                      |
| 80-100%      | 0 responses                      |
| n/a          | 27 (11 ARL; 16 Oberlin) 57%      |

**[1.14] Have you made recorded sound objects available on:**

- a) the Internet?
- |     |                                    |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| Yes | 17 (12 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 31%         |
| No  | <b>41 (14 ARL; 27 Oberlin) 69%</b> |
- b) an Intranet?
- |     |                                    |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| Yes | 17 (6 AL; 11 Oberlin) 29%          |
| No  | <b>39 (18 ARL; 21 Oberlin) 71%</b> |
- c) CD-R?
- |     |                                   |
|-----|-----------------------------------|
| Yes | <b>29 (21 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 53%</b> |
| No  | 29 (5 ARL; 24 Oberlin) 47%        |
- d) CD-ROM?
- |     |                                    |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| Yes | 17 (10 ARL; 7 Oberlin) 32%         |
| No  | <b>37 (15 ARL; 22 Oberlin) 68%</b> |
- e) DVD?
- |     |                                    |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| Yes | 14 (7 ARL; 7 Oberlin) 27%          |
| No  | <b>40 (16 ARL; 24 Oberlin) 73%</b> |
- f) Analog media?
- |     |                                    |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| Yes | <b>44 (22 ARL; 22 Oberlin) 80%</b> |
| No  | 12 (3 ARL; 9 Oberlin) 20%          |

- g) Other answer:  
13 (7 ARL; 6 Oberlin)

“Rights present a barrier to placing items on the Internet”  
Also making transfers to DAT format.  
Four respondents mentioned development of electronic reserves.

## 2.0 Rights

### [2.1] Do you have challenges with legal compliance and:

- a) **Your right to preserve unpublished holdings?**  
Yes 8 (5 ARL, 3 Oberlin) 14%  
No 50 (21 ARL; 29 Oberlin) 86%
- b) **Your right to preserve rare commercial recordings?**  
Yes 13 (9 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 25%  
No 45 (17 ARL; 28 Oberlin) 75%
- c) **Privacy rights of oral history recording subjects?**  
Yes 19 (13 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 36%  
No 37 (12 ARL; 25 Oberlin) 64%
- d) **Your right to offer access to commercial recordings?**  
Yes 27 (15 ARL; 12 Oberlin) 48%  
No 31 (11 ARL; 20 Oberlin) 52%
- e) **Your right to offer access to unpublished recordings?**  
Yes 20 (14 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 36%  
No 32 (12 ARL; 20 Oberlin) 64%
- f) **Describe other impediments:**

16 respondents (12 ARL; 5 Oberlin)

#### ARL respondents:

“Looking at my understanding of copyright law, limited as it is, you are allowed to make one copy of something for preservation purposes. It is the access that really is the question down the line.”

“There are no challenges based on our understanding of ‘fair use.’”

“We worry about ‘fair use’ and copyright law because everything is changing so fast, there is a lot of confusion about which direction to go.”

“Lack of clarity of copyright law is the biggest issue. Documentation is the greatest problem in identifying rights.”

“In many cases, determining the copyright holders of particular sound recordings is not possible with our current resources.”

“Determining copyright holders is not possible in many cases.”

“There are a number of unprocessed gift collections for which we do not know the status of rights.”

“Digital access to recordings is highly problematic.”

“We must be concerned with the failure of collection users to comply fully with their copyright compliance obligations when using research duplicates which we have created.”

**Oberlin respondent:**

“Have had challenges by students to download music onto the laptop computers which I constantly remind them is not legal.”

**[2.2 ] Estimate the percentage of your recorded sound collection that includes documentation that could be useful in sorting out ownership or copyright issues:**

<b>0-20 %</b>	<b>13 (4 ARL; 9 Oberlin) 21%</b>
20-40%	5 (4 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 9%
40-60%	9 (4 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 15%
60-80%	10 (6 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 17%
80-100%	9 (5 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 16%
N/A	17 (4 ARL; 13 Oberlin) 22%

**[2.3] If your library has items from its audio collection on the Internet:**

- a) Did you consult an attorney about the risk?
- |           |                                  |
|-----------|----------------------------------|
| Yes       | 14 (10 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 49%       |
| <b>No</b> | <b>12 (5 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 51%</b> |
- b) Did you post the audio without legal consultation?
- |           |                                  |
|-----------|----------------------------------|
| Yes       | 9 (5 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 36%         |
| <b>No</b> | <b>16 (9 ARL; 7 Oberlin) 64%</b> |
- c) Are you confident you have obtained all necessary legal permission (clearances)?
- |            |                                   |
|------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Yes</b> | <b>18 (10 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 69%</b> |
| No         | 8 (5 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 31%          |
- d) Are offerings restricted to public domain matter?
- |           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| Yes       | 7 (5 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 27%          |
| <b>No</b> | <b>18 (10 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 73%</b> |

**3.0 Preservation****[3.1] Define the values of a sound recording that make it worthy of preservation.**

54 respondents (27 ARL; 27 Oberlin) [duplicative answers deleted below]

**ARL respondents:**

- [UNIVERSITY] has a large collection of electronic reserves deemed worthy of preservation because they have been requested. Otherwise, you will get a different answer to this question from everyone you ask.
- This is a big question. It really depends on the intellectual value and artifactual value ascribed to the piece by the collection managers and the individuals in our library that are responsible for that item. However, uniqueness would be one thing that would make it worthy. Potential for use, a hard thing to judge, but we do it all the time. Those are probably the two biggest. The third I would say is the stability of the media and the ability to locate playback equipment.
- Uniqueness, research value, need for preservation.
- Music - unique or rare; instantaneous recordings that are fragile; local history value; inability to replace. Oral history collection is all worthy of preservation.

5. Format, performer, content value, teaching value, language.
6. Historical value; rarity; research interest.
7. Importance of the performer. Fragility, such as lacquer-coated instantaneous discs and cylinders. Value to instruction is important, too.
8. Must be old or rare and make some contribution to scholarly knowledge. We have examples of some of the first recordings, including the voice of Florence Nightingale from 1890, up to Henry Ford, Thomas Edison, Amelia Earhart, and others. Hearing these voices adds another dimension to our understanding of who these people were.
9. 1) Content, research value 2) scarcity 3) quality of sound.
10. Given our collection policy, which focuses on political, economic, and social change in the 20th and 21st centuries, we collect and preserve recordings that include oral histories and speeches of people who have made an impact on this period.
11. Recordings of music document differences in performance practice for classical music and are the primary sources for the creation of jazz and popular music. Recordings of radio broadcasts document live musical performance, drama, news, and cultural events that do not appear in written sources. Recordings of musicians readers, lecturers, politicians, etc. provide an exact rendering of their work that convey nuances and meaning that cannot be represented through a transcript of the event or through notated music. Recordings of prominent performers and other people whose contributions are historically and culturally significant are primary candidates for preservation, but also the work and oral histories of ordinary people document life and events from previous decades. Some recordings are on media whose physical properties deteriorate faster than other such as acetate discs, acetate tapes, and some Mylar tapes. Others are recorded on formats for which the machines for playback are obsolete and are not easily used such as cylinders, wire recordings, and early-computerized sound.
12. High use; Unique; Research value; State of Preservation.
13. Content, uniqueness, user interest, sound quality, historical value, value to teaching..
14. Value of content, usefulness to teaching, uniqueness, historical value, user interest, and sound quality.
15. Content, uniqueness, historical value, potential curricular use, user interest, sound quality.
16. Uniqueness, historical value, condition of original.
17. Uniqueness.
18. Significance of content.
19. Content, uniqueness, relevance of content to mission of the library.
20. In the music library, sound recordings are neither more nor less worthy of preservation than other formats. It is the content that matters.
21. Uniqueness or comparative rarity; content value for research and teaching; sound quality; lack of stability of the medium.
22. Uniqueness or comparative rarity; content value for research and teaching; sound quality; lack of stability of the medium. Unique historical conversation that cannot be replicated or has not existed in that form previously; is autobiographical in nature but historically focused.
23. Uniqueness or comparative rarity; content values for research and teaching; sound quality; lack of stability of the medium; documentation of a musical work; aesthetic documentation of a performance; oral histories--unique historical conversation that cannot be replicated and has not existed in that form previously; autobiographical in nature but historically focused.
24. 1) recordings of well-known musicians, faculty, and the important performances of contemporary music. 2) Oral history. 3) Unique recordings of primary sources, such as the [expedition] recordings.... 4) Unique recordings of interviews with prominent persons from the theatre.
25. Unstable materials; poor condition; damaged materials.
26. Archival significance.
27. Unique documentation of a core subject or under documented subject; potential research value.

**Oberlin responses:**

28. Of historical interest to the institution. Of historical interest to the state or nation. Collections or rare cultural recording made commercially. Out of print.
29. Some combination of: Uniqueness; quality; enduring historical value (e.g. as a historical "record" of the College, or a voice recording of eminent individual.
30. Best recording; number of pressings/copies made; artist or speaker prominence
31. Selection and requests.
32. Quality of sound, performer/speaker, uniqueness.
33. It represents a unique performance/event of a creative work by an artist.
34. Rarity; value of content; obsolescence of medium; amount of use.
35. In general: 1) Intellectual, artistic, or cultural content 2) Format (obsolete formats, errors in pressings, etc.)
36. Unique or original recording of a campus event. Popular out of print title.
37. For our situation: 1. Importance to institutional history 2. Importance to the curriculum 3. Rarity; no means of obtaining a replacement copy in original medium or new medium (for commercial recordings).
38. Rare or unique status; preservation condition of the original; manner in which the item/content relates to research goals of our institution and the larger scholarly community; amount of use the item is likely to receive.
39. Local, on-campus concerts or a heavily used item that is no longer commercially available
40. Cultural Historical Pedagogical Rareness Relates to the college.
41. Preservation-worthy criteria: 1. Representative of an important artist or artistic form or period.  
2. Rare or rarely in good condition. 3. For a collection, comprehensive or representative of the material collected.
42. Relative rarity historic performance/importance of performer or conductor.
43. A sound recording of a noteworthy performance or the speaker/singer/conductor provided rare insight into a body of work. It would also be valuable to house somewhere one recording of every single published work of music.
44. We have not undertaken any preservation measures for our sound recordings. At this point I would only approve making a preservation copy of a sound recording held in the Archives that is of a lost or no longer used format.
45. Uniqueness that is of some historical, social, or scientific significance.
46. Our non-commercial recordings are local projects, for example oral histories of alums who lived through [a power plant accident].
47. Much depends on local context. All unique/rare recordings cannot be preserved, so one needs to consider the item's relevance to local history, to the curriculum, to the collection in which it sits, as well as other cost/time/staff factors.
48. Speakers or performances of historical importance to college.
49. Rarity, intellectual significance, unstable recording medium.
50. The nature of the work and the quality of the performance.
51. One of a kind interviews. Age of material. Stability of recording format.

**Keyword = # of appearances in responses to question 3.1:**

unique, uniqueness = 25  
 history, historic, historic value = 21 (not, oral history)  
 rare, rarity, rareness = 17  
 content = 15  
 music = 12  
 quality = 10  
 research, research value = 9

sound quality = 6  
 teaching, teaching value = 6  
 content value, value of content = 6  
 culture, cultural = 5  
 oral history = 3  
 intellectual, intellectual value = 3  
 scholar, scholarly = 2  
 curriculum, value to the curriculum = 2

**[3.2] In your inventory of preservation-worthy sound recordings, estimate the percentage that are:**

- a) original or master recordings
- |              |                                   |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>0-20%</b> | <b>16 (5 ARL, 11 Oberlin) 28%</b> |
| 20-40%       | 5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 8%           |
| 40-60%       | 4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 7%           |
| 60-80%       | 8 (5 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 15%          |
| 80-100%      | 13 (6 ARL; 7 Oberlin) 22%         |
| n/a          | 11 (6 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 20%         |
- b) rare commercial recordings
- |              |                                    |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>0-20%</b> | <b>27 (10 ARL; 17 Oberlin) 48%</b> |
| 20-40%       | 7 (3 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 13%           |
| 40-60%       | 5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 9%            |
| 60-80%       | 2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 3%            |
| 80-100%      | 0 responses                        |
| n/a          | 15 (10 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 27%         |

**[3.3] What percentage of your preservation-worthy sound has been copied to:**

- a) duplication masters
- |              |                                    |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>0-20%</b> | <b>24 (13 ARL; 11 Oberlin) 45%</b> |
| 20-40%       | 4 (2 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 7%            |
| 40-60%       | 4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 7%            |
| 60-80%       | 0 responses                        |
| 80-100%      | 2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 3%            |
| n/a          | 21 (8 ARL; 14 Oberlin) 38%         |
- b) listening copies
- |              |                                    |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>0-20%</b> | <b>28 (13 ARL; 15 Oberlin) 50%</b> |
| 20-40%       | 3 (3 ARL) 5%                       |
| 40-60%       | 7 (3 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 13%           |
| 60-80%       | 0 responses                        |
| 80-100%      | 0 responses                        |
| n/a          | 18 (6 ARL; 13 Oberlin) 32%         |

**[3.4] What percentage of your preservation-worthy sound inventory is accessible for listening?**

0-20%	9 (4 ARL; 5 Oberlin) 17%
20-40%	2 (2 ARL) 1%
<b>40-60%</b>	<b>16 (8 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 32%</b>

60-80%	4 (1 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 8%
80-100%	22 (10 ARL; 12 Oberlin) 42%

**[3.5] Of those items of recorded sound for which you do not have listening copies, what percentage is denied access for preservation reasons?**

<b>0-20%</b>	<b>37 (15 ARL; 22 Oberlin) 71%</b>
20-40%	5 (1 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 9%
40-60%	2 (2 ARL) 4%
60-80%	3 (2 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 6%
80-100%	5 (5 ARL) 10%

**[3.6] What percentage of your recorded sound collection lacks appropriate playback equipment, presenting a barrier to preservation?**

<b>0-20%</b>	<b>43 (19 ARL; 25 Oberlin) 81%</b>
20-40%	2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%
40-60%	6 (3 ARL; 3 Oberlin) 11%
60-80%	2 (2 ARL) 4%
80-100%	0 responses

**[3.7] Have you undertaken a recorded sound preservation project in the last 5 years? If so, what was the reason? Please explain: [open-ended question]**

36 respondents (27 ARL; 19 Oberlin)

**ARL responses:**

1. Our digitization is viewed more as a service to the school of music and faculty and students, but it is indeed preservation.
2. Reformatting some oral histories... because the original cassettes were deteriorating...
3. Yes. To restore deteriorating masters.
4. Preservation is on demand. We have 100s of thousands of hours of material to go. We are seeking grant money to copy all 8,000 of our cylinders.
5. Yes,...re-record some Edison recordings. We are constantly migrating everything to digital.
6. We have raised \$250,000 from private sources for a conservation laboratory that will include digital audio equipment.
7. [Recordings] of [a jazz festival] and individual items that were determined to be at risk of deteriorating [have been preserved].
8. Special Collections has undertaken three small sound preservation projects in the last eight years. The impetus was to provide access and preserve high use and unique audio records. An equally important goal was to develop project plans and standards for digitizing spoken work audio.
9. Reformatting of open reel tapes, transfer of cylinder recordings to other formats, processing of tapes with 'sticky-shed'.
10. Reformatting of spoken word poetry LPs; audio from video tapes copied and preserved; [NAME] Linguistics collection - cylinders duplicated; Mozart Vocal music - open reel tapes preserves and duplicated.
11. Reformatting of the Vocal Series from open reel. Very few items are not considered accessible.
12. We operate an ongoing preservation process as sound objects are requested. Collections are 100

percent accessible. Recorded sound objects are never denied when specifically requested. Only about 1 percent of objects are lacking appropriate playback equipment.

13. Yes. [We reformatted] a collection [from the] 1950s to 1970s, ca 5,000 hours, carried out 1998 to present. Reason for project: deterioration of media.
14. Eisenhower Era political Histories, 1000 hours, carried out 2002 to present.
15. Composers Tapes, 1960-1990, 320 hours, carried out in 1997-98 2) Composer forum tapes, 600 hours, carried out 1998-99 Reason for projects: Deteriorating conditions.
16. We have cleaned our collections of transcription disks (2,000) and placed them in acid free containers. We have created duplicate cassettes and reel-to-reel copies of original cassette recordings of unique theatre personnel interviews. We have created duplicates of reel-to-reel tapes of literary value, and created use cassette copies of same.
17. Yes. [We copied a collection] of Indian music. [In addition at our institution is also a long term] digital library initiative.

#### **Oberlin responses:**

18. We have not. We need to.
19. [The institution has done a] format transfer of U-matic, reel to reel, and Beta to VHS holdings.
20. Yes: [We have done a survey of a song collection] to assess state of collection and provide foundation for future preservation work and grant applications.
21. In 1998 [the institution sent out] a small group of reel-to-reel tapes of College recital performances [to a private company] where they were rewound and repackaged.
22. [The institution] is developing a Web-based project to make oral history material available.
23. Yes. Some of our old on-campus concerts were recorded onto reel-to-reels, and we converted them to audiocassette.
24. Yes, we had an opportunity to take advantage of a sound engineer using funds out of our operational budget.
25. [Preservation is under way for a] retrospective conversion of LP collection; collection of oral history interviews with jazz musicians and will be transferring to DVD with master and use copies.

#### **[4.0] Funding and Resources**

##### **[4.1] What is the number of FTEs in your institution assigned to your recorded sound collection?**

- a) audio engineer(s)

Of 41 respondents (21 ARL; 20 Oberlin) to this question, 30 reported 0 audio engineers; 11 respondents who reported employees did so at an average of 0.73 FTEs.

- 1 ARLs reported 2 audio engineers
- 3 ARLs reported 1 audio engineer
- 4 ARLs reported .5 or fewer audio engineers
- 14 ARLs reported 0 audio engineers
- 2 Oberlins reported 1 audio engineer
- 2 Oberlins reported .5 or fewer audio engineers
- 16 Oberlins reported 0 audio engineers

## b) curator(s)

Of 45 respondents (23 ARL; 22 Oberlin) to this question, 16 reported 0 curators; 29 respondents who reported curator positions did so at an average of 0.9 FTEs.

- 1 ARLs reported 3 curators
- 4 ARLs reported 2 curators
- 2 ARLs reported 1.5 curators
- 5 ARLs reported 1 curator
- 6 ARLs reported .5 or fewer curators
- 6 ARLs reported 0 curators
- 2 Oberlins reported 2 curators
- 3 Oberlins reported 1 curator
- 5 Oberlins reported .5 or fewer curators
- 12 Oberlins reported 0 curators

## c) cataloguer(s)

Of the 49 respondents (23 ARL; 26 Oberlin) to this question, 14 reported 0 cataloguers. Those reporting staffing of the position did so at an average of 0.59 FTEs.

- 1 ARLs reported 5.5 cataloguers
- 2 ARLs reported 2 cataloguers
- 1 ARLs reported 1.75 cataloguers
- 3 ARLs reported 1 cataloguer
- 7 ARLs reported .5 or fewer cataloguers
- 9 ARLs reported 0 cataloguers
- 1 Oberlins reported 3 cataloguers
- 1 Oberlins reported 2 cataloguers
- 2 Oberlins reported 1.5 cataloguers
- 3 Oberlins reported 1 cataloguer
- 2 Oberlins reported .75 cataloguers
- 13 Oberlins reported .5 or fewer cataloguers
- 5 Oberlins reported 0 cataloguers

## d) student staff

Of the 44 respondents to this question (22 ARL; 22 Oberlin), 14 reported 0 student staff. Respondents reporting student staff did so at an average of 1.14.

- 1 ARL reported 6 student staff
- 1 ARL reported 5 student staff
- 1 ARL reported 3 student staff
- 6 ARLs reported 2 to 2.5 student staff
- 3 ARLs reported 1 to 1.5 student staff
- 5 ARLs reported .5 or fewer student staff
- 6 ARLs reported 0 student staff
- 1 Oberlin reported 6 student staff
- 3 Oberlins reported 3 student staff
- 1 Oberlins reported 2 student staff

5 Oberlins reported 1 to 1.5 student staff  
 2 Oberlins reported fewer than .5 student staff  
 10 Oberlins reported 0 student staff

e) reference staff

There were 46 respondents (22 ARL; 24 Oberlin) with 18 reporting 0 reference staff. The respondents reporting reference staff did so at an average of 0.55.

1 ARL reported 3.5 reference staff  
 1 ARL reported 3 reference staff  
 1 ARL reported 1.7 reference staff  
 5 ARLs reported 1 reference staff  
 9 ARLs reported .5 or fewer reference staff  
 6 ARLs reported 0 reference staff  
 2 Oberlins reported 4 reference staff  
 3 Oberlins reported 1 reference staff  
 1 Oberlin reported .75 reference staff  
 6 Oberlins reported .5 or fewer reference staff  
 12 Oberlins reported 0 reference staff

f) preservation specialist(s)

Of the 41 respondents to this question (20 ARL; 21 Oberlin), 27 reported having 0 preservation specialists. Respondents reporting preservation specialists did so at an average of 0.1.

1 ARLs reported 1 preservation specialist  
 3 ARLs reported .5 preservation specialists  
 6 ARLs reported .25 or fewer preservation specialists  
 11 ARLs reported 0 preservation specialists  
 1 Oberlins reported .25 preservation specialists  
 4 Oberlins reported .1 preservation specialists  
 16 Oberlins reported 0 preservation specialists

g) other

21 respondents (14 ARL; 7 Oberlin) reported other employees and made other comments.  
 1 ARL reported 1 general clerical staff position.  
 1 ARL reported that this question [4.1] was difficult to answer because audio engineers and other audio specialists exist in other parts of the university. While they are available as needed, they cannot be counted as library or special collection staff.  
 1 Oberlin reported a 0.5 music librarian  
 1 Oberlin reported that all recorded sound is the responsibility of individual department heads in consultation with the music librarian.

**[4.2] Is your budget for preservation and access of sound recordings a specific line item?**

ALL =	Yes	3 respondents (3 ARL; 0 Oberlin) 5%
	No	55 respondents (23 ARL; 32 Oberlin) 95%

ARL =	Yes	3 respondents 11%
	No	<b>23 respondents 89%</b>
Oberlin =	Yes	0 respondents 0%
	No	<b>32 respondents 100%</b>

**[4.3] Estimate the percentage of your budget for preservation and access (not including acquisitions) from:**

a) dedicated funds		
	<b>0-25 %</b>	<b>16 (4 ARL; 12 Oberlin) 28%</b>
	25-50%	2 (2 ARL) 1%
	50-75%	2 (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) 4%
	75-100%	5 (3 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 9%
	n/a	31 (15 ARL; 18 Oberlin) 58%
b) soft money		
	<b>0-25%</b>	<b>15 (4 ARL; 11 Oberlin) 26%</b>
	25-50%	1 (1 Oberlin) 1%
	50-75%	2 (2 ARL) 4%
	75-100%	11 (11 ARL) 23%
	n/a	25 (8 ARL; 20 Oberlin) 46%

**[4.4] What is the size of your budget for preservation and access of sound recordings?**

- 50 respondents (27 ARL; 23 Oberlin) answered this question.
- 21 respondents reported annual spending at a grand total of \$1,367,800 (\$1,342,000 ARL or an average of \$51,600 per responding ARL institutions; \$34,800 Oberlin or an average of \$1,500 per responding Oberlin institution) or an average of \$27,300 among all responding institutions, excluding those answering "\$0.00" or "not known."
  - **28 respondents (13 ARL; 15 Oberlin) said \$0.00**
  - 6 respondents (3 ARL; 3 Oberlin) answered "Not Known"
  - 1 respondent (1 Oberlin) reported \$800
  - 2 respondents (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) reported \$1,000
  - 1 respondent (Oberlin) reported \$2,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$3,000
  - 2 respondents (1 ARL; 1 Oberlin) reported \$5,000
  - 1 respondent (Oberlin) reported \$25,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$30,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$30,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$35,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$50,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$85,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$100,000
  - 1 respondent (ARL) reported \$300,000

- 1 respondent (ARL) reported a budget of \$330,000
- 1 respondent (ARL) reported a budget of \$400,000

*Of all respondents, only three ARL institutions reported that sound recordings were given a line item in formal budgets (question 4.2). Most work from grant money or allocate a portion of employees' time.*

## [5.0] Policy

### [5.1] Does your library or institution have a written policy for

- a) preservation of original sound recordings  
 Yes 10 (8 ARL; 2 Oberlin) 20%  
 No 45 (16 ARL; 29 Oberlin) 80%
- b) inventory control  
 Yes 20 (12 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 38%  
 No 35 (12 ARL; 23 Oberlin) 62%
- c) bibliographic control  
 Yes 39 (16 ARL; 23 Oberlin) 72%  
 No 16 (8 ARL; 8 Oberlin) 28%
- d) property rights  
 Yes 25 (11 ARL; 14 Oberlin) 49%  
 No 28 (11 ARL; 17 Oberlin) 51%
- e) privacy rights (especially with spoken work/oral history holdings)  
 Yes 22 (11 ARL; 11 Oberlin) 45%  
 No 30 (11 ARL; 19 Oberlin) 55%
- f) appraisal of recordings  
 Yes 10 (6 ARL; 4 Oberlin) 21%  
 No 40 (14 ARL; 26 Oberlin) 79%
- g) de-accessioning  
 Yes 17 (10 ARL; 7 Oberlin) 37%  
 No 32 (10 ARL; 22 Oberlin) 63%
- h) dealing with duplicates  
 Yes 16 (10 ARL; 6 Oberlin) 35%  
 No 34 (11 ARL; 23 Oberlin) 65%
- i) collection development plan  
 Yes 34 (20 ARL; 14 Oberlin) 69%  
 No 18 (2 ARL; 16 Oberlin) 31%
- j) disaster preparedness and/or recovery  
 Yes 43 (22 ARL; 21 Oberlin) 80%  
 No 12 (2 ARL; 10 Oberlin) 20%

k) other, please describe:

13 respondents (8 ARL, 5 Oberlin)

**ARL responses:**

"Recording fees."

"Policies vary among units."

"Anything not covered with a written policy is covered by a blanket policy."

"Nothing has been specifically written to cover sound recordings."

"General policies of the library apply."

**Oberlin responses:**

"For e) privacy rights: copyright permissions only."

"All policies from library policy dealing with printed holdings."

"[We also have a] duplication policy [for patron requests]."

# APPENDIX 1

## Scan of Recorded-Sound Surveys

*by David Randal Allen  
The Communications Office, Inc.  
January 2003*

---

*All URLs were valid  
as of August 10, 2004*

### Introduction

Before planning and implementing the CLIR Survey of Recorded Sound, our first step was to review surveys that, at least in part, had already investigated the status of special collections, including recorded sound. The oldest survey was conducted in 1995; the newest is still in progress. Most of the surveys attempted in some manner to quantify the inventory of recorded sound held by a specific constituency of collections; however, there were a few overlapping inquiries. All the surveys attempted to answer different questions for widely different purposes.

Of the surveys reviewed and described in the following pages, three exclusively investigated aspects of recorded sound in collections, proving useful to planning for the Survey of Recorded Sound:

- **Survey of Endangered Audio Carriers.** This survey looked at quantities and conditions of recording media (that is, carriers) from 1890 to the present. It did not include information about content.
- **Folk Heritage Collections in Crisis.** The objective of this survey was to develop a baseline data set of the nation's original audio recordings in organizational and individual folklore collections. The survey did not gather enough data to achieve this objective. The survey report further notes that its inventory data are flawed because most respondents did not understand the difference between an "original" or "preservation master copy" and a "listening copy."
- **National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences Survey of Master Recording Libraries.** This survey investigated master recordings held in recording studios and audio archives. It looked at the quantities, formats, ages, cataloging, conditions, and evidence of rights of primarily commercial recordings. It did not further investigate the content of the holdings.

## Conclusions

On the basis of our review of the surveys, we offer the following conclusions:

- There is no authoritative dataset describing the content, location, and preservation status of recorded sound held in special and private collections in the United States. Furthermore, there appears to be no single approach to gathering such data.
- Dedicated budgets for the management of recorded-sound collections are limited or nonexistent.
- Most collections lack supporting materials, such as releases or other information, necessary to resolve intellectual property and copyright questions that pertain to their holdings.
- Proper storage conditions for recorded sound are understood, but collections are not always stored accordingly.
- The most widely held format in the sound collections surveyed appears to be magnetic audiocassettes (compact audiocassettes). Note: This is not believed to be the case for original sound holdings that the CLIR survey investigated.
- The range of views concerning the need, techniques, and emerging standards for preservation of recorded-sound collections may be well understood by preservationists, but not always by collections managers.
- While some formats of recorded-sound media are more urgently in need of preservation than others, all formats are in some need of preservation, identification, cataloging, or reformatting.
- The costs and requirements for preserving and offering access to a recorded-sound collection may not be well understood by those responsible for creating such collections.

## Reference of examined surveys

**Survey of Endangered Audio Carriers.** *Conducted by the International Association of Sound Archives (IASA) on behalf of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). 1995.*

This survey investigated the condition of a wide variety of sound carrier media, including cylinder recordings, direct cut acetate discs, shellac discs (commercial 78 rpm), vinyl discs (33 rpm and 45 rpm), acetate tape (1/4-inch audio), polyester tape (1/4-inch audio, compact audiocassettes, and R-DAT tapes), PVC tape, compact audiocassette, R-DAT tape, compact discs, and a few other rare carriers.

The survey results were based on information provided in 133 replies from a variety of institutions, as well as small private collections, from 35 countries. The report concluded that there is some deterioration among all formats, but that acetate disc and tape recordings are at the highest risk of loss and in most urgent need of migration to more stable formats.

Additional information is available at the University of San Diego Web site at <http://history.acusd.edu/gen/recording/notes.html>.

**Folk Heritage Collections In Crisis.** *Conducted by the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress in partnership with the American Folklore Society (AFS), the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM), and the Council on Library and Information Resources. December 2001.*

This was a nationwide survey of original recorded ethnographic audio collections (original masters or field recordings) held by institutions and individuals. Two thousand surveys were mailed to the membership of AFS and SEM and to other collectors; 297 responses (178 organizations and 119 individuals) were received.

The survey gathered some interesting information but did not meet all its objectives. Pointing to the need for access systems and preservation planning, the survey report concluded that there is a “functional and intellectual disconnect between those responsible for creating the collections and those charged with caring for them.” It further concluded that (1) there is a need to educate those responsible for creating ethnographic audio recordings about archival terms and basic practices; and (2) there is a need for infrastructure support and funding for “small- to medium-sized collections located at state arts agencies, museums, and similar cultural organizations.”

The survey report noted that not enough data were gathered to fulfill the objective of the survey to establish “a baseline dataset about the nation’s recorded folklore.” Instead, the survey succeeded in revealing “where the state of knowledge ends and ignorance begins.”

The report is available at <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub96/contents.html>.

**National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS) Survey of Master Recording Libraries.** *Conducted by REDA International on behalf of NARAS/The Grammy Foundation. June 1998.*

The 87 respondents to this survey included 51 recording studios and 36 audio archives. Areas covered included age, size (masters and nonmasters), location, cataloging status, and copyright status of collections; access to professional specialists; types of media in collections; markings; growth of collections; safety copies; conditions of master recordings; preservation efforts; staffing; training; maintenance; quality control; information management; budgets; disposal of collection items; storage locations; temperature, humidity, air-filtration, and fire-control systems; and formats of safety copies.

For more information about the survey, contact the Grammy Foundation, 3402 Pico Blvd., Santa Monica, CA 90405.

**Ethnographic Thesaurus Working Group Questionnaire: Survey of Potential Stakeholders.** *Conducted by the American Folklore Society in collaboration with the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress and George Mason University. Supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. March 2002.*

The purpose of the Thesaurus Project was to “assist folklorists, archivists, and catalogers working with folklore and folk music col-

lections by establishing consistent subject terminology for the description of ethnographic materials." Survey results were reported in April 2002 at the Ethnographic Thesaurus Working Group.

A total of 180 surveys were mailed and 70 replies were received. The questionnaire asked respondents whether or not sound recordings were included among a list of eight other collection formats. Fifty-six respondents noted that their collections included "traditional music," and 54 respondents reported "oral history" titles in their collections, without indicating the quantity, condition, or audio format.

The survey data are being used to build an online thesaurus located at <http://www.afsnet.org/thesaurus>.

**TAG (Technical Assistance Grant) Technical Assistance Report: Database Needs Assessment for Folk Arts Programs.** *Conducted by the Folk Arts Group of the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA). 2001.*

This survey was conducted as a needs assessment and focused on information management requirements. Approximately 125 surveys were distributed to folk arts collections, and 43 responses were received. Only one of the 70 questions on the survey dealt with audio. It asked respondents to identify the "forms of audio media" contained in the archive but did not ask for the number of records or information on their conditions.

More information about NASAA can be found at <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/main.start.shtml>.

**Association of Research Libraries: Special Collections in ARL Libraries.** *Sponsored by ARL Research Collections Committee. 1998. The survey report, published in 2001, was written by Judith Panitch of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.*

This survey took a wide view of special collections. Questions covered the changing role of the research library in higher education; the effects of digitization; the challenge of selecting, preserving, and making available the cultural record of the nineteenth century and beyond; and the potential for cooperative action.

Audio collections are one of 10 special collections categories profiled in the appendix of the survey (Table 1: Collections, p. 77). They are viewed from the perspectives of collection type, location, and number of records. No specific information is provided concerning content or audio preservation status.

Survey results are available at <http://www.arl.org/collect/spcoll/panitch/index.html>.

**Heritage Health Index.** *Sponsored by the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the Getty Grant Program, The Bay Foundation, and Peck-Stacpoole Foundation.*

The survey has been distributed to 15,000 potential respondents across the nation. The sampling will be from among a "randomly selected group of archives, historical societies, libraries, museums, and

research collections." The survey aims to "document the condition and needs of U.S. artistic, historic, and scientific collections held by archives, historical societies, libraries, museums, and research collections."

The 12-page survey is designed to investigate a range of special collections materials, including recorded sound. It asks about four categories of sound media: grooved media; magnetic media; optical media; and other. The survey asks respondents to provide the number of units in each of the categories and the preservation condition in each category.

Data collected in preliminary tests of the Heritage Health Index can be found at <http://www.heritagepreservation.org/programs/HHIpr3.htm>.

# APPENDIX 2

## Survey Respondents

---

### ARL<sup>1</sup>

University of Chicago  
 Columbia University  
 Cornell University  
 Harvard University  
 Indiana University  
 Michigan State University  
 New York University  
 Ohio State University  
 Stanford University  
 Syracuse University  
 University of California, Los Angeles  
 University of California, Santa Barbara  
 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
 University of Michigan  
 University of Missouri, Kansas City  
 University of Texas at Austin  
 University of Washington  
 Yale University

### Oberlin Group Libraries<sup>2</sup>

Albion College  
 Alma College  
 Amherst College  
 Augustana College  
 Austin College  
 Bates College  
 Baylor University  
 Beloit College  
 Bowdoin College  
 Bryn Mawr College

Carleton College  
 Claremont College  
 Colgate University  
 Davidson College  
 Denison College  
 Dickinson College  
 Franklin Marshall College  
 Grinnell College  
 Hamilton College  
 Haverford College  
 Hope College  
 Lawrence University  
 Marquette University  
 Mt. Holyoke College  
 Oberlin College  
 Reed College  
 Rollins College  
 St. John's College  
 Scott College  
 Sewanee University  
 Simmons College  
 Skidmore College  
 Smith College  
 Trinity University  
 Vassar College  
 Wellesley College  
 Wesleyan University  
 Wheaton College  
 Whitman College  
 Whittier College  
 Willamette University  
 Williams College

---

<sup>1</sup> Received 27 responses from 18 libraries. Five institutions filed more than one questionnaire.

<sup>2</sup> Received 55 completed electronic questionnaires from 51 institutions. Two institutions filed two questionnaires from separate units. Twelve institutions answered the questionnaire but did not identify themselves.