
There has been little published research on the orchestra librarianship profession, what it entails, how it has changed over time, and what attention is paid to it in the LS curricula. There have been several studies published to date regarding other forms of special librarianship, specifically serials and cataloging. Responses to these studies indicate a general consensus that education in these specialized fields of librarianship is lacking in the LS curricula. It is likely that what holds true for serials education will also hold true for orchestra librarianship education. This paper seeks to determine what being an orchestra librarian entails, how the job has changed in the last thirteen years, and what current orchestra librarians view as the proper education for a future professional. These and other questions are addressed through analysis of electronic surveys sent to Principal librarians of each major orchestra in the United States. It was determined that most orchestra librarians feel an MLS is not as useful for being a professional as a background in music performance is. However, if a future orchestra librarian were to pursue an MLS degree, courses in preservation, database systems, and cataloging are the most important to take.
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INTRODUCTION

Every performance by a professional symphony orchestra is the result of not just many hours of practice by the musicians, but also of countless hours of work performed by the orchestra librarian. The orchestra librarian can spend as much as a year preparing for one concert, and is responsible for score and parts acquisition, cataloging, editing and copying parts, and coordinating string bowings with the principal string players. Despite the orchestra librarian’s vital role as a member of the symphony, there has been little information written about the profession, as is the case with many specialized fields of librarianship. Consequently, no studies have been done on what the profession entails, with the exception being a 1995 study conducted by a student at UNC-Chapel Hill.

The purpose of my research is to address the following two questions: In what ways has the orchestra librarian profession changed since 1995, and what attention is paid to orchestra librarianship in the Library Science curricula? The possibility exists that the curriculum an aspiring orchestra librarian needs in school may not be offered by many, if not all, ALA-accredited LS programs. These issues will be addressed by determining what practicing orchestra librarians feel has changed in the profession since 1995, and what education they think aspiring orchestra librarians need to have upon entering the workforce. The potential implications of this research may contribute to a better understanding of orchestra librarianship by identifying what exactly an orchestra librarian does, and what courses should be offered by LS programs to better educate and train future orchestra librarians. This might improve the curriculum offered by ALA-
accredited LS programs by offering either a specialization in performing arts/orchestra librarianship, or at least a class focused on the field.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Due to the highly specialized nature of orchestra librarianship, no studies have been written about the profession that focuses on the issues this paper seeks to address. For this reason, studies focused on serials librarianship were chosen as they directly deal with the same issues concerning orchestra librarianship; those of a highly specialized field which is under-represented in the LS curriculum. The conclusions drawn from these studies can be inferred to be the same concerning the field of orchestra librarianship.

Over the last thirty years, four major surveys have been published that focus on the availability of serials courses in LS programs and whether they provided adequate training to prepare students for a career in a specialized field of librarianship.

Benita M. Weber (1974) described the results of a national survey given to serials librarians following a course in serials offered at Drexel University in the summer of 1973. This study was one of the first given to determine the state of serials education in the U.S. and has been cited in many subsequent surveys of serials education in the LS curriculum.

For her survey, Weber used the 1972/73 American Library Directory to identify recipients of her questionnaire, of which she chose 1538 libraries which met specific criteria for number of volumes in the library and the periodicals budget. Separate statistics were kept for college libraries and special libraries; although in most cases the results for both groups were very similar. A forty percent sample was taken using a
random number table, and in order to simulate the actual percentage of college and special libraries in the U.S., 69 percent of this sample were college libraries (461) and 31 percent were special libraries (189), for a total of 605 libraries. The questionnaire used by Weber was intended to be short, while still allowing for as much open-ended responses as possible, and was addressed to the serials librarian for each college and special library listed in the *American Library Directory* where available. Three hundred and sixty-one responses to the survey were received, a 60% return. Results of the survey showed that courses serials librarians felt specifically trained them for their work included automation, reference, government documents, and cataloging and classification. Courses serials librarians felt were not adequately covered in their LS programs included manual handling, with an average of 37% of the respondents indicating this, automation (39%), and acquisitions (30%). Additional comments by the respondents indicated courses such as business management should be added to the curriculum, and that more effective communications were needed between serials librarians and between departments at each institution. Weber found that the results showed a deficiency in the formal education received by many working serials librarians, but acknowledged that these results cannot be called conclusive. Her recommendations were that the ALA should propose a suggested syllabus for serials education, which library school administrators should look closely at their courses to determine how serials librarianship can be effectively added to the curriculum, and to increase the amount of continuing education workshops offered for serials librarians.

Ten years later, Diane Stine (1985) conducted a survey to determine if any of the recommendations made by Weber had been carried out. Unlike Weber’s survey, Stine
limited the recipients of her questionnaire to only ALA-accredited library schools. Of the sixty-two questionnaires that were sent out, fifty were returned (80 percent), with the goal of determining how many schools offered a course in serials, if that course was required, what percentage of students at each school enrolled in the course, and how often the course was offered. The survey also looked at other courses that covered serials topics and to what extent. Of the fifty responding schools, four indicated they were closing the following year, one did not currently offer a serials course but would the following year, and another felt that most of the tech-services skills were better acquired at the undergraduate level. Of the remaining forty-four schools, eighteen indicated they have a course devoted to just serials work, and all but five of them covered the following topics: collection development, acquisitions, administration, cataloging, preservation, and automation. Of the other five schools, one did not include cataloging and automation as part of the serials course, but had separate courses for each instead. Another school did not include collection development or preservation, and did not cover these topics in any other course.

Of the schools that offered a serials course, cataloging, automation, and collection development were most often the primary foci of each course. Many of these same schools also offered general courses that devote some time to these aspects of serials. According to her survey, schools that did offer a serials course suffered from a lack of interest by the students to enroll in it, with ten schools responding that under 10% of the students take the serials course. In every school that offered a serials course, no more than half of the enrolled students took it, and according to Stine, this lack of interest would become a detriment to the librarian who ends up in the serials department years
after graduating. Stine recommended that each school require either a serials course or combination of several general tech-services courses which introduce serials topics. By doing this, Stine concluded, library schools could ensure that graduates would be better prepared for careers as serials librarians.

Mary Ellen Soper (1987) also conducted a survey of serials courses and units offered by ALA-accredited library schools. Like Stine’s survey, Soper sent out sixty-two questionnaires, with responses requested only from those responsible for teaching the serials course. Soper also sent a follow-up to those who did not respond initially, and received 53 responses total, for a response rate of 84%. Sixteen of the responding schools (30%) offered separate serials courses, of which nine had prerequisite cataloging courses; and thirty-three schools offered serials units. Of these thirty-three schools, sixteen covered serials cataloging in advanced courses only, eight offered a unit in introductory courses only, and nine offered coverage in both an introductory and advanced course. Of the seven schools that did not offer either a separate course or unit on serials, four said their curriculum made no provision for covering the topic, while the other three provided minimal exposure by providing workshops, practicums, and special projects. Soper found there was no agreement as to whether special training was required of serials catalogers in addition to the instruction given in a general cataloging class, as only twenty-six of the responding schools felt there was. Soper also agreed with Benita Weber that continuing education is vital for serials librarians, especially when most of the extended instruction in serials happens in advanced courses that are usually electives, and are not taken by most graduate students. Soper stressed the need for continual learning after the MLS, and concluded that students should expect most of their future education to be informal,
rather than formal. Soper also came to the conclusion that educators do not agree with the practitioners of serials librarianship that serials should continue to be an important part of the LS curricula, and that this debate would likely continue for many more years.

Naomi Kietzke Young (2005) also evaluated the curriculum of LS programs to see what changes had taken place since the publication of Mary Ellen Soper’s survey nearly twenty years previous. Using a questionnaire based on Diane Stine’s survey, with additional questions about electronic resources, Young sought to determine whether the circumstances surrounding the disconnect between educators and practitioners had changed and how. In this paper, Young indicated that very little had changed in the proportion of serials courses and, as Soper stated in her survey, formal LS education was and would be only a limited answer to the needs of new serialists.

The methodology used by Young differed from the previous studies in that besides the survey, Young also reviewed the websites of all LS schools for course listings and descriptions. According to the websites examined, eleven of the fifty-six ALA-accredited schools offered a specific serials course. In five of those schools, serials was mentioned in other courses, while for the remaining six schools the serials course was the only one that covered the topic. Flaws in this methodology do exist, however, as the presence of a catalog listing does not indicate course frequency, or whether the class is taught by an adjunct or permanent faculty member. If a course is offered infrequently, some students will not have the opportunity to take the class, so it is likely that results gained from this examination over-represent opportunities for formal serials education. The website evaluations were included in the overall study to supplement the survey, possibly due to the poor response rate it received, which was only 30% compared to the
80% of Stine’s survey and the 84% response rate to Soper’s survey. Young attributed this low rate to either bad timing or the apparent length of the survey. Of the seventeen responding schools, only three (17.6%) reported having a dedicated serials course.

Young concluded that it would be unreasonable to expect an increase in the proportion of LS schools offering a serials course, as that proportion had remained essentially the same for the last thirty years. Like Stine and Soper, Young concluded that formal, graduate-level library education would not be enough to train serials librarians, but instead continuing education opportunities should be publicized and provided by local and national library associations. Another suggestion made by Young was to support LS programs by offering field experience sites, and for serials librarians to become adjunct professors for LS classes.

Though not specific to serials work, Cynthia C. Ryans (1978) conducted a survey of cataloging practitioners in order to determine their feelings about the importance of cataloging courses in library school and what would be the most useful way to teach them. This survey is interesting because of what it reveals about practitioner’s attitudes toward library school curricula. Like the previous surveys, questionnaires were sent to each ALA-accredited library program, for a total of sixty, of which forty-two were returned for a 70% response. The questionnaire was designed to determine the views of practicing catalogers on topics relating to cataloging education. These topics included cataloging course content, new trends in libraries, and the future needs for cataloging librarians. Results of the survey show that while all the respondents thought cataloging should be a basic course in the LS curriculum, thirty-two (76%) thought the curriculum was still incomplete. A strong background in theory was wanted as well, as 64% of the
respondents thought that there was enough, if not too much, theory being taught. Respondents also indicated that theory was not enough and should be combined with practical training, such as hands-on learning in the form of field-experience, as Young suggested in her survey a quarter-century later. What is most telling about this survey was the response to the question asking if the catalog department heads thought the typical MLS student was adequately prepared for the job, to which twenty-six (62%) respondents answered no. What’s more is that thirty-three (79%) respondents felt that what was being taught in the cataloging course at their school did not accurately reflect the actual procedures of cataloging in the university library catalog department. These department heads also felt there was an inadequate coverage of serials in the LS curriculum. Solutions proposed by Ryans for this problem included: more cooperation between the library school and the catalog department, practicing catalogers teaching the course as adjunct professors (like Young suggested), and having the student work part-time in the catalog department.

Karen M. Letarte, Michelle R. Turvey, Dea Borneman, and David L. Adams (2002) described a more recent survey concerning the importance of cataloging competencies for all entry-level academic librarians. They sought to determine whether a basic set of competencies is needed by entry-level academic librarians, as determined by public and technical services practitioners in academic libraries. To explore this question, the researchers sent questionnaires to librarians working in Association of Research Libraries (ARL) institutions. Unlike the surveys in the field of serials, this survey included institutions in Canada as well as the United States, and the questions were based on a document, in this case the ALCTS Education Policy Statement. Of the 222
individuals surveyed, 120 replied for a response rate of 54%. The survey included twenty-five questions focusing on thirty-nine cataloging competencies, which the respondents were asked to rank by importance on a four-point scale. As was the case in the Ryans survey, results from this survey indicated that respondents felt theoretical and practical knowledge are equally important, with theory ranking slightly higher than practice, indicating the need for hands-on work experience. While a majority of the information collected for this survey is not specific to serials work, the findings demonstrated the importance of cataloging education, along with a basic set of core competencies for the field, even though there has been a documented decrease in the amount of required cataloging courses in ALA-accredited programs. This has created the same distinct gap found in serials education, between the state of LS curricula in ALA-accredited programs and the views of the public and technical services practitioners in academic libraries surveyed in this study. Letarte, Turvey, Borneman, and Adams shared Cynthia Ryan's opinion that there should be renewed dialogue between practitioners and educators on the role of cataloging education in the graduate curriculum, and the content of the cataloging courses.

Ingrid Hsieh-Yee (2004) evaluated the coverage of cataloging in LS programs in North America and collected the views of faculty members on how to provide students in cataloging with the competencies needed to be effective in the workplace. A multi-part survey was designed and distributed to the fifty-two ALA-accredited LS programs in North America, of which forty-seven were returned, for a response rate of 90%. The first part of the survey focused on the coverage of cataloging and the third part focused on faculty opinions on cataloging education. The second part of this survey did not contain
information relevant to my own research and thus has not been included. Results of this survey differed from previous surveys conducted on trends in cataloging education, as the data for this survey was provided by educators instead of course syllabi. Findings from the first part of the survey show that from 1997 to 2002, the amount of LS programs offering an introductory level course in cataloging doubled, from 38% to 79%, suggesting an increased appreciation for cataloging, and a higher exposure rate for students to the concepts of cataloging. Findings from the third part of the survey, which used a series of statements to assess educators’ views on cataloging education, show that many educators believed cataloging played an important role in information organization, and thus the library school curricula should continue to offer not just introductory level courses, but advanced cataloging as well. While the percentage of programs offering a cataloging course remained high, the number of programs actually requiring the course showed a downward trend, with slightly more than half of the programs surveyed requiring such a course. One problem Hsieh-Yee pointed out is that while more LS programs cover the basics of cataloging in required introductory courses, the lack of a required cataloging course has probably resulted in fewer students graduating with sufficient preparation for cataloging careers.

Barbara B. Moran (2001) discussed the issue of the growing rift between the educators and the practitioners of the library field in an essay for *Library Journal*. In this essay, Moran mentioned steps taken by the ALA to address these concerns, such as the formation of new ALA task forces to define core competencies and core values, both suggestions being found in the surveys already discussed. Moran pointed out that among practitioners, discontent about LS education can be seen in the platform statements of
candidates seeking office in professional organizations. One such statement came from Michael Gorman, past president of the ALA, in which he asked, “can the American Library Association and the LIS schools work together to produce a national core curriculum? … If we do not … the crisis in library education will become a catastrophe” (Gorman, 2004, p.101). In order to repair the rift between educators and practitioners, Moran said that both sides need to work together to reestablish their common cause so that the traditions of librarians from the past will continue in the future as libraries continue to change, along with the knowledge and skills needed of future librarians.

Each of these publications highlight the fact that there is now, and has been, a growing divide between what educators of specialized fields of librarianship are teaching and what the practitioners of these specialized fields believe should be taught. Educators and practitioners alike have expressed their concerns that less and less programs require courses such as serials and cataloging while the need for graduates with this knowledge has increased. While there has not been much attention given to orchestra librarianship, as a specialized field like serials and cataloging, it is probably safe to assume it is facing the same problem. It is easy to say that a closer partnership is needed between library educators and library practitioners in order to better prepare special librarians for careers after the MLS, but this sentiment has been expressed many times over the last twenty-five years, and yet little progress has been made. The following study will determine if the same holds true today for orchestra librarianship.
METHOD

Data collection for research into what the orchestra librarianship profession entails, how it has changed over time, and what current orchestra librarians view as the proper education for a future professional was achieved through the use of a computerized, self-administered questionnaire, sent to the principal orchestra librarian of each of the major orchestras in the United States. This trend study examined the changes within a population (orchestra librarians) over time, from 1995 to 2008, and was chosen as the ideal method because it provided both quantitative and qualitative data with which to support conclusions regarding the state of orchestra librarianship. Quantitative data were collected about how many people work in the orchestra library, their educational background, and their work experience. Qualitative data were collected about the librarians’ positive and negative job experiences and their educational preferences for future orchestra librarians.

Survey

Computerized self-administered questionnaires were administered to the principal librarians of the 150 major orchestras and institutions in the United States as identified on the Major Orchestra Librarians’ Association (MOLA) website, allowing for single-stage sampling. The questionnaires were distributed via email, and were completed and the results recorded using online survey software. The respondents were asked how many librarians work in their orchestra library, what their educational background is, and questions pertaining to the operational procedures of their library. They were also asked what they saw to be the current overriding issues in orchestra librarianship. Lastly, the
librarians were asked if orchestra librarians could benefit from obtaining a Masters of Library Science degree, and if so, what they thought an adequate LS curriculum for a future professional should include. The questionnaire can be viewed in the Appendix.

Benefits and Limitations

The computerized self-administered questionnaire approach was the most logical choice for data collection due to the distance between each symphony orchestra. The benefits of conducting surveys are that reliability is high because all subjects of the study are given a standardized stimulus, and the careful wording of the questions also significantly reduces the subject’s own unreliability. Surveys do not require a major time investment on the part of the subjects, and they provide empirical data that can be easily tabulated. Respondents of the surveys can also add their own feelings and experiences to help interpret the data, which can also increase the study’s validity, if the responses align closely with the empirical data. The benefits to conducting surveys in electronic form as opposed to paper form is that electronic submission is the simplest and fastest way to send and receive the questionnaires, which allows for a rapid turnaround in data collection, the records are stored electronically with password protection so they can't be misplaced or viewed by unwanted persons, and the participants have more flexibility to complete and change answers as necessary.

The limitations to web-based surveys are that they rely on technology in order to be completed successfully. If the respondent has any technical issues, the survey may not be completed and returned. The rate of return can also be affected since web-based surveys do not need to be returned together at the same time. Another limitation of the
survey method is respondents may not fill out and/or return them, and they may not fill them out correctly.

**Ethical Issues**

The ethical issues of this study were extremely minimal. Like any study when personal information is gathered, the utmost care was given to make sure the privacy of all respondents was respected. While anonymity cannot be achieved due to the email addresses contained in the returned questionnaires, confidentiality can be guaranteed as any identifying characteristics of the respondents will be withheld in the publication of the results. Survey respondents were informed their participation was completely voluntary, and that they did not have to answer any question that made them uncomfortable in doing so. No incentives were given to the respondents as inducement for completion of the survey, other than helping to create a better LS curriculum for future orchestra librarians. This study was approved by the Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill under reference number 08-0439.

**RESULTS**

Questionnaires were distributed to the Principal Librarians of every American orchestra or institution affiliated with the Major Orchestra Librarians’ Association (MOLA), totaling 150 librarians. 41 surveys were returned for a response rate of 27%, however, five surveys were missing information in various areas and one survey was returned with no information at all.
Demographics

Of the 41 survey respondents, 10 librarians stated their orchestra did not employ any full-time librarians, 16 stated their orchestra employed one full-time librarian, 11 stated their orchestra employed two, and 3 stated their orchestra employed 3 full-time librarians, which can be seen in Figure 1. Fourteen orchestras do not employ any part-time librarians, 17 employ one part-time librarian, 5 orchestras employ two part-time librarians, 2 employ three part-time librarians, and 1 orchestra each employs four and five part-time librarians, seen in Figure 2. When compared to the results of a similar survey conducted in 1995 by Christi Birch Blackley (Appendix B), it is evident that there has been little change in the amount of part-time staff per orchestra, while the amount of orchestras with no full-time staff has increased dramatically.

[Figure 1. Full-Time Library Staff per Orchestra]

[Figure 2. Part-Time Library Staff per Orchestra]
Education and Background

When looking at the degrees held by the responding librarians (Figure 3) it is clear that having an MLS is not as important as having a degree in music. Three of the respondents have an MLS, and another six have bachelor’s degrees in non-music fields such as architecture, chemistry, and accounting. The overwhelming majority of degrees held by librarians in the responding orchestras are bachelor of music degrees, of which the majority are performance degrees. Other bachelors of music degrees held by librarians in the responding orchestras are in the fields of composition and education.

Compared to the results of the 1995 survey, both the bachelor’s and master’s of music performance degrees are still the most frequently held by orchestra librarians, however, there has been a significant increase in the amount of bachelors of music degrees held while the masters degree is held by fewer librarians.

Most of the respondents to the survey entered the field of orchestra librarianship by either having had other previous experiences such as working as a performance librarian in college, performing librarian duties for local community bands, or by being a performer in their orchestra. Other responses include “No one else wanted to do it when there was an opening,” “Part-time work to earn extra money as an assistant, discovered I
liked the work and was in an organization that offered a library mentorship opportunity,”
and “As a means to support myself while performing in a regional orchestra. I later moved to doing library work full time as I found it more important and fulfilling.” The majority of librarians surveyed indicated they had previous library experience working in academic music libraries (Figure 4). When compared to the results from 1995, the same trend can be seen. Surprisingly, there were more orchestra librarians with experience working in non-music departments of public libraries than there were who worked in a music department. Other previous experience listed included working in a middle school library and running the performance rental music library at the music publisher Boosey & Hawkes.

[Figure 4. Other Library Experience of Orchestra Library Staff]

**Operational Procedures**

When asked what types of materials their orchestra library holds (Figure 5), each survey respondent indicated performance sets (scores and parts). This figure is not surprising as performance sets are essential for an orchestra to have when giving a concert. Only half of the survey respondents indicated their respective orchestra library holds sound recordings. This figure is greater than in 1995 when only 33% of the survey
respondents indicated their library held sound recordings, however, as most symphony concerts are recorded, it is surprising this figure isn’t higher.

When asked how records of past performances are maintained (Figure 6), two-thirds of the survey respondents indicated their records are maintained on a computer database, while 42% of the respondents indicated their records are maintained in a manual file and 30% of the respondents indicated the library is not responsible for maintaining performance records at all. Not surprisingly, there has been a shift from storage by manual file to computer databases since 1995, with an increase of 22% for computer databases and a decrease of 10% in manual file storage. There has not been a significant change in the software programs used by orchestra librarians since 1995 (Figure 7), as the majority still use word processing programs or other programs such as Microsoft Excell. Determining change in computer database usage is difficult, as OPAS was not in use when the original survey was conducted, and has since replaced OLIS which was used by 66% of the respondents to the 1995 survey.
Respondents were asked whether it is the librarians’ responsibility to track copyright fees for the orchestra, of which 46% answered both yes and no (Figure 8). Other responses included “concert halls office tracks all fees for the school,” and “We have blanket licenses.” This represents an increase of 10% of the number of librarians responsible for tracking copyright fees since 1995.
Issues and Opinions

Questionnaire respondents were asked to discuss what they felt were the current overriding issues in orchestra librarianship. Thirty-three surveys were returned with valid responses, and one simply stated “?none?” Of the thirty-three responses given, 33% mentioned the lack of information regarding copyright issues, and how the copyright law is not keeping up with technological advancements in recording and distribution of music. Other issues mentioned include the high cost of obtaining music from publishers and vendors, a lack of communication between music directors and management, and the poor quality of materials.

When it comes to involvement with professional organizations, only 21% of the respondents felt orchestra librarians could benefit from being involved with organizations other than MOLA, while 64% of the respondents were not sure (Figure 9). These figures represent a dramatic change in attitude toward involvement with professional library organizations since 1995, when 39% of the survey respondents felt orchestra librarians could benefit from being involved with organizations other than MOLA and only 14% of the respondents weren’t sure.

[Figure 9. Benefit of Professional Organization Involvement Besides MOLA]
When asked if their needs as an orchestra librarian have changed since 1995, most survey respondents answered in the affirmative, with the exception of four who said no change at all has occurred and two who replied they couldn’t answer due to having limited experience as an orchestra librarian. Of those who answered in the affirmative, the majority again mentioned dealing with copyright issues, as well as the rising expectations of the librarian by orchestra administrators without increasing the library staff. Other issues mentioned include the lack of recognition as a musician and member of the orchestra (not just a staff member or secretary), and the rise of self-published composers who expect the librarian to act as printer/publisher and create scores and parts for them.

Survey respondents overwhelmingly indicated they felt orchestra librarians could not benefit from obtaining a Masters of Library Science degree (Figure 10). This figure is not too surprising based on the number of current orchestra librarians who do have an MLS (only 3 of the survey respondents have this degree). Of those respondents who did feel orchestra librarians could benefit from obtaining an MLS, 70% felt that orchestra/performing arts librarianship was different enough from traditional music librarianship to require special training (Figure 11). Each survey respondent who felt this way also stated that Library Science programs should offer a course in performing arts librarianship (Figure 12). Questionnaire respondents who felt orchestra librarians could benefit from obtaining an MLS were asked what courses they thought would be most beneficial for an aspiring orchestra librarian to take while in a Library Science program (Figure 13). A course in preservation was viewed as being the most important, with 100% of the respondents indicating so. Courses in database systems and cataloging were also
high on the list, with response rates of 88% and 75% respectively. Only 38% of the respondents felt courses in management, collection development, and archives would be beneficial. One respondent also suggested a course in copyright law would be beneficial. While most Library Science programs don’t offer this course in their own departments, most major universities allow students to take courses for credit in other departments.

[Figure 10. Percentage of Orchestra Librarians Who Feel an MLS Would Be Beneficial]

[Figure 11. Percentage of Orchestra Librarians Who Feel an MLS Would Be Beneficial and that Orchestra Librarianship Requires Special Training]
Continuing Education and Participant Comments

When asked if they have attended any seminars, workshops, or other continuing education courses related to orchestra librarianship, 69% of the survey respondents replied “yes.” This amount is not surprising since most orchestra librarians feel they cannot receive the proper education in school. The questionnaire ended with the opportunity for the respondents to share any additional comments they had concerning training for orchestra librarians. Many of the respondents share the opinion that on the job training, in the form of internships, apprenticeships, and fellowships, is the best way to gain the necessary skills to be a successful orchestra librarian. Many of the respondents also
believe it is necessary to be trained as a professional musician, as problems can arise that can only be dealt with by a person who knows what it is like to be on stage.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study conclude that the majority of responding orchestra librarians feel much has changed in the profession in the last thirteen years, most notably in the area of copyright law. Other changes in the profession that have occurred in the last thirteen years include the emergence of self-published composers who expect the librarian to act as both printer and publisher, an increase in the library’s responsibilities without an increase in staff to match, and a lack of recognition as a musician and member of the orchestra. Unfortunately, these issues cannot be addressed in an academic setting, but must be resolved with increased communication between the orchestra librarian and their orchestra administration.

A majority of the responding orchestra librarians felt that future professionals would benefit more from obtaining a degree, or having experience in, music performance as opposed to having a Masters of Library Science degree. However, the amount of orchestra librarians who hold a Masters of Library Science degree has increased in the last thirteen years, and of those librarians, the majority feel that orchestra/performing arts librarianship is different enough from music librarianship to require special training. The survey and the discussion of the results demonstrate the existence of a basic set of core performing arts librarianship competencies as viewed by practitioners in both orchestra libraries and academic institutions in the United States. These professionals view preservation, database systems, and cataloging education as highly valuable for all entry-
level orchestra librarians. Along with a stated desire for education in the area of copyright law, these courses could form the basis of a specialization in performing arts librarianship in the Library Science curriculum.

Because the field of orchestra librarianship is not well known, creating an entire specialization devoted to performing arts librarianship may not be feasible at the present time. The statements provided by the survey respondents indicate, however, that the quality of preparation of future practitioners is a vital issue for the profession. But if the amount of students enrolled in a Library Science program who are interested in the field of performing arts librarianship is too small to justify creating an entire specialization, how should educators prepare entry-level orchestra librarians? This study suggests the best way to prepare an entry-level orchestra librarian is to provide them with hands-on training in the form of internships or field-experiences. This can best be achieved by having library science faculty members create partnerships with local professionals from symphony orchestras or the like. Whatever the solution may be, it is clear from the study and available literature that a closer partnership between library educators and practicing orchestra librarians is essential in answering the question of how best to prepare future orchestra librarians.
APPENDIX A – 2008 STUDY

1. How many full-time librarians does your orchestra employ?

   0  1  2  3  4  5
   ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

2. How many part-time librarians does your orchestra employ?

   0  1  2  3  4  5
   ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

3. How many of the following degrees are held by you and any others working in the orchestra library?

   0  Masters of Music Education
   0  Masters of Music (Performance)
   0  Master of Music Composition
   0  Masters of Musicology
   0  Masters of Library Science
   0  Bachelors in Music
   0  Bachelors - non-music
   0  Doctorate in Music

4. How did you come to enter the field of orchestra librarianship?

   [Blank space for description]

5. Do you, or your staff, have other library experience apart from working in orchestra libraries? If so, in what type(s) of libraries? (Check each box that applies.)

   ☐  Public libraries, music department
   ☐  Public libraries, non-music department
6. What types of materials does your orchestra library hold?

☐ Performance sets (scores and parts)
☐ Bound programs of your orchestra
☐ Sound recordings
☐ Reference books
☐ Study scores
☐ Other

7. How are records of past performances maintained?

☐ No records are maintained
☐ Records are maintained, but not by the orchestra library
☐ On a computer database
☐ In a manual file

8. What database or software programs do you use?

☐ OPAS
☐ OCLC
☐ Word processing programs
☐ None
☐ Other

9. Is it the librarians' responsibility to track copyright fees for the orchestra?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Other
10. What do you see as the current overriding issues in orchestra librarianship?

11. Do you feel that orchestra libraries could benefit from more contact with professional library organizations (besides MOLA)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] Maybe
- [ ] Very little
- [ ] No

12. Aside from technological advancements, have your needs as an orchestra librarian changed over the last ten years? If so, please explain.

13. Do you feel orchestra librarians could benefit from obtaining a Masters of Library Science degree?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

14. In your opinion, is orchestra/performing arts librarianship different enough from music librarianship to require special training?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
15. Do you feel Library Science programs should offer a course in performing arts librarianship?

☐ Yes
☐ No

16. Besides a course in performing arts librarianship, what other courses do you feel would be beneficial for an aspiring orchestra librarian to take while obtaining an MLS?

☐ Cataloging
☐ Reference
☐ Collection Development
☐ Preservation
☐ Management
☐ Database systems
☐ Archives
☐ Other

17. Have you attended any seminars, workshops, or other continuing education courses related to orchestra librarianship?

☐ Yes
☐ No

18. Any additional comments you care to provide concerning training for orchestra librarians will be welcomed and greatly appreciated.
APPENDIX B - 1995 STUDY

1. How many librarians does your orchestra employ?
   full-time 0 1 2 3 4 5  part-time 0 1 2 3 4 5

   Full-Time Library Staff per Orchestra

   Part-Time Library Staff per Orchestra
2. How many of the following degrees are held by you and any others working in the orchestra library?

RESPONSES (37): *it has been inferred that the 3 remaining respondents did not answer the question because none of the degrees mentioned were held by the librarians*

- Masters of Music Education: 6
- Masters of Music (Performance): 24
- Masters of Musicology: 2
- Masters of Library Science: 2

Other degrees:
- 5 Doctorates in Music
  - 1 DMA in Performance and Literature
  - 1 DMA in Composition
  - 1 Doctorate in Theory and Composition
  - 1 Doctorate of Music (unspecified)
  - 1 Doctorate in Music Performance

- 1 Master of Music Composition
- 1 Master of Elementary Education

24 Bachelors in Music:
- 12 Bachelors of Music (unspecified)
- 7 Bachelors of Music Education
- 1 Bachelor of Violin Performance
- 2 Bachelors of Music Performance
- 1 Bachelor of Music Performance and Education
- 1 Bachelor of Arts in Music

- 2 Bachelors - non-music:
  - 1 Bachelor of Arts
  - 1 Bachelor of Science

(Most likely other bachelor degrees are held that are not shown here. Because the possible answers for this question only mentioned masters degrees, some respondents could have assumed that the surveyor was only concerned with degrees at the master's level and above.)

Other information:
* Besides the 2 Master of Library Science degrees already held, 1 respondent reported lacking only one semester towards completion of this degree, and 1 other noted that he or she had taken some courses in library science.
* 26 of the responding libraries employ at least one librarian with a master's or doctorate in music.
* 37 music degrees at the master's or doctorate level are held
3. How did you come to enter the field of orchestra librarianship?

RESPONSES (36)

Most answers fell into one or more than one category as below:

PLAYER/PERFORMER: 14 respondents mentioned playing for an orchestra before assuming the duties of librarian. One respondent had also worked with orchestras in the capacities of composer and copyist. Another said, "As a performer I complained that the music preparation was poor and that (even) I could do better. I was told to prove it and I did ..."

NEEDED THE JOB/MONEY: 10 respondents mentioned finances as having a role in their career choice. Two of these needed the money to supplement income as a player, three mention money as the reason they started as an assistant librarian, and two mention money as the reason they started performing librarian duties for a university or college orchestra.

ASSISTANT/APPRENTICE: 8 respondents; 4 started out as as assistants for professional orchestras, and 4 refer to "apprenticeships" with professional orchestras.

OTHER PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE: 8 respondents; 5 began their career by performing librarian duties for university or college orchestras, 1 worked at a summer music camp as librarian, 1 performed librarian duties for a local community band while in high school. The 1 other respondent in this category may have begun her career at a younger age than all others: "In 4th grade I offered to take care of the orchestra music in return for having my violin lessons paid for."

RIGHT TIME, RIGHT PLACE: 3 respondents allude to being in the right time at the right place as they began their career.

*COINCIDENCE/ACCIDENT*: 2 respondents use these words in describing how they embarked on their career.

LESS STRAIGHTFORWARD ANSWERS: 1 respondent replied "I usually tell people my parole officer got it for me", and another simply said, "Merde happens."

OTHER: 1 respondent answered, "It was foisted upon me and I discovered I liked it. I compose and arrange quite a lot and I naturally organize things." Another respondent worked in the orchestra's ticket office and then took the position of librarian when it opened up.
4. Do you or your staff have other library experience, apart from working in orchestra libraries? If so, in what type(s) of libraries? (Circle one * for each experience.)

RESPONSES (20); the remaining 20 gave no answer to this question. Because no space for a negative answer was provided, the surveyor is inferring that in 19 cases, those who left this question unanswered have no staff with non-orchestra library experience.

SOME NON-ORCHESTRA LIBRARY EXPERIENCE: 15 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries, music department</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries, non-music department:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic music libraries:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic, non-music:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music publishing libraries:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical radio station libraries:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO NON-ORCHESTRA LIBRARY EXPERIENCE: 24 respondents

5. What types of materials does your orchestra library hold?

RESPONSES (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance sets (scores and parts):</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound programs of your orchestra:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound programs of other orchestras:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound recordings:</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference books:</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study scores:</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity scrapbooks:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral music:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/archival material:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File of reference parts:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano/vocal scores:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How are records of past performances maintained? (Circle one.)

RESPONSES (40)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No records are maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Records are maintained, but not by the orchestra library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>On a computer database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which one?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Custom-designed on Unix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R-base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Word Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foxpro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D-base 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>other custom-designed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>In a manual file.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by those where no records are maintained:
* 1 respondent added "as of yet".
* 1 respondent replied that his memory is the source of records.
* 1 respondent explained that records were manually kept until about 1975, since when no records exist until the present. Old sources are being used to create records to be kept on Profession File database.

Comments by those where some other department keeps records:
* 1 respondent mentioned that the current record system is now changing to OLIS.

Comments by those where manual files are kept:
* 4 respondents explained how records are kept: "on orchestration cards", "same as card catalog", "by composer", and "copies of printed programs".

Other information:
* 11 respondents answered that both manual files and a computer database are kept; 1 of these explained that records were being added to OLIS but were not all on the database yet.
* 1 respondent kept a manual file for personal use in addition to the records kept by another department.

7. What computer databases or software programs do you use? (Circle all that apply and include purpose.)

RESPONSES (33); 4 additional questionnaires answered every other question on the page, causing the surveyor to infer that a lack of response for #15 means they use no computer databases or programs. Of the 33 responses, some did not list any purposes.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Word processing programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>None [3 wrote it in, 4 were inferred]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Is it the librarians' responsibility to track copyright fees for the orchestra?  

RESPONSES (40); "copyright fees" was a poor choice of wording for what is normally referred to as "performance right fees", causing some confusion. Because of this confusion, 3 responses are unusable.

- 20 No
- 15 Yes
- 2 Other

Other Comments:
* 2 "No" respondents mentioned that their orchestras held blanket licenses; 1 of these said that although the blanket license is handled by the administration, it is the library's responsibility "to see that copyright laws are adhered to across the board."
* 1 "Yes" respondent commented "To some extent. Our bursar pays ASCAP and BMI and the librarian makes sure that composers are credited."

9. What do you see as the current overriding issues in orchestra librarianship?

RESPONSES (33)

10 respondents: the low salaries, contracts (being under a staff contract instead of a musician's contract), and the value of the position as perceived by managers and musicians.

6 respondents: the condition and fees of rental music

4 respondents: communication with other departments/managers

4 respondents: heavy workloads with insufficient staff or insufficient funding for staff

4 respondents: financial problems of orchestras in general

3 respondents: the future of the orchestra, orchestera "diversity", more programming of non-traditional repertoire

2 respondents: centralized information sources

2 respondents: copyright/grand rights

1 respondent each:
- no computer support
- more editing/proofing
- more emphasis on paperwork
- relations with publishers
- giving in
- communication between orchestras
- electronic retrieval
- too many computers
- training seminars for community orchestras
- storage space
- preservation
- organization and quality control
10. Do you feel that orchestra libraries could benefit from more contact with professional library organizations (besides MOLA)?

RESPONSES (36)

14    Yes
5     Maybe
5     Very little
12    No

*Yes* Comments
* *some MOLA members attend ... and the info they have provided has been very interesting ... no reason to reinvent the wheel ... we are seeking more contact now ...*
* *particularly in the area of special collections, i.e. ethnic music*

*Maybe* Comments
* Comments: *maybe librarians who are expected to research info about relatively unknown composers*
* *perhaps in organizational info; otherwise no - it's pretty much a case of apples and oranges*
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