

Amanda C. Myers. Film Scholars' Library Use Characteristics in Research Universities. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S. degree. July, 2004. 35 pages. Advisor: Evelyn Daniel

Film studies scholars are interdisciplinary scholars, a blend between the fine arts discipline and humanities discipline. Unlike art or drama, film scholars in universities do not usually reside in dedicated film programs, but inside larger departments such as English or Communication. Historically, the primary sources of film studies have been neglected acquisitions by research libraries. In this study, 38 scholars from three research universities in North Carolina share the characteristics of film scholars. With these considerations, the library use characteristics of film scholars were investigated and compared to the library use patterns of humanist and fine arts faculty. The findings showed that the film scholars shared many library use characteristics with the humanist faculty with the following exceptions. The literature film scholars use is diverse and the faculty maintained their own subscriptions and collections. In addition, the respondents tended to use the Internet as a primary source of information more than humanist scholars.

Headings:

Audio-visual Library Service – Evaluation

Research Libraries – Use Studies

Library Surveys

FILM SCHOLARS' LIBRARY USE CHARACTERISTICS IN RESEARCH  
UNIVERSITIES

by  
Amanda C. Myers

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty  
of the School of Information and Library Science  
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Science in  
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

July 2004

Approved by

---

Evelyn Daniel

## **Introduction**

In the academic library, humanities scholars have historically been the consummate patron, requiring texts from all time periods, a variety of bibliographies and indexes to identify new research, and services like reference and interlibrary loan to assist in finding and receiving an obscure source. The traditional humanist scholar, like historians and literature scholars are well researched and well served by academic libraries. However, there are faculty in the humanities who need more than the traditional library services and materials.

Film studies scholars are interdisciplinary scholars, a blend between the fine arts discipline and humanities discipline. Unlike art or drama, film scholars in universities do not usually reside in dedicated film programs, but inside larger departments such as English, Communication, or Foreign Languages. Historically, the primary sources of film studies, audio visual materials, have been neglected acquisitions by research libraries. In this study, 38 scholars from North Carolina State University (NCSU), the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, (UNC-CH), and Duke University (Duke) share the characteristics of film scholars. With these considerations, the library use characteristics of film scholars were investigated and compared to the library use patterns of humanist and fine arts faculty.

A survey of the film scholars at NCSU, UNC-CH, and Duke will assess their attitudes, perceptions and use behaviors of the library and its services for research and instruction. The survey will investigate if the D.H. Hill library at NCSU, the Academic

Affairs libraries at UNC-CH, and the Perkins System libraries at Duke provide effective resources for this population, or alternatively, if film scholars are dependent on outside resources. The three library systems offer different styles of service to the film studies. DH Hill Library's media center is dedicated to the acquisition requests of faculty and has limited circulation privileges. The House library of UNC-CH also has a media center but with a wider acquisitions and circulation policy. The Lilly library at Duke is a branch library dedicated to fine arts, philosophy and film studies. Therefore the responses from this survey are applicable to other film studies scholars at different academic institutions. The outcome of this survey will be beneficial to future acquisitions policy of AV material, information literacy instruction, and liaison development for the film studies program.

### **Literature Review**

Libraries serve the information needs of their current and future populations. In order to avoid obsolescence and to expand their understanding of information needs, library and information science (LIS) researchers conduct behavioral research. Two major paradigms of behavioral research are the positivist and postpositivist paradigms (Wang 56). The positivist paradigm, established in the early nineteenth century, assumes that human behavior can be explained through objective observation. This paradigm has proven extremely useful to LIS providing the field with such concepts as bibliometrics, human-computer interaction and systems analysis. The quantitative methodology was invented out of the positivist paradigm to measure scientific observation. The quantitative methodology tests hypotheses by translating human behavior into independent and dependent variables.

Sharon Baker and F. Wilfrid Lancaster wrote a book summarizing LIS inquiry entitled *The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services*. They begin their review of the various methodologies for assessing libraries by framing their book around the concepts of accessibility and convenience. Accessibility is multi-faceted, including societal, institutional, psychological, intellectual, bibliographic and physical accessibilities (Baker & Lancaster 28). Baker and Lancaster cite the least-effort model as an accurate, replicable model of information seeking behavior. The least-effort model of information seeking claims that a person will use the information seeking process that he/she perceives to be the easiest. An information seeker will also avoid any process or environment that is perceived to be painful. Thus, Baker and Lancaster deduce that accessibility is a significant aspect of information seeking. Through systems analysis and bibliometrics and the study of architecture and location of libraries, LIS researchers have a strong understanding of bibliographic and physical accessibilities. The societal, psychological, and intellectual information accessibilities describe the information seeker and therefore are ever-changing as user expectations, needs and competencies change.

To observe the societal, psychological and intellectual accessibilities and their evolution LIS researchers develop user studies and isolate variables in the information seeking process. The scope of user studies in LIS varies greatly from studies of information seeking behavior of broad groups, like lawyers; studies of information seeking behavior of a single institution, like a university; studies of the use of a single library or department, like an information commons; studies of the use of a specific library service, like virtual reference (Baker & Lancaster 369). In the academic library setting scholars have found some very different information seeking patterns among the

disciplines, especially the sciences and the humanities, which will be discussed later in this literature review. With all the grades of difference in information seeking behavior Baker and Lancaster have found some uniform generalizations. To summarize Baker and Lancaster,

“The implications are simple: If people use a service, tool, or library and see its benefit, they will perceive it as accessible to them and will be likely to use it again; however, it is not enough for librarians simply to tell people about the benefits. Librarians must somehow make patrons perceive the relevance of a service to their lives and to experience the rewards of using it before the patrons’ opinion of its accessibility will change” (33).

Although isolating characteristics of a population does lead to observable information seeking differences in user studies, one behavior observed continuously through all groups is the desire for accessibility and ease of use.

There are direct and indirect ways of conducting user studies. Direct methods include surveys or interviews. Indirect methods include analyzing circulation statistics or reshelfed books (Baker & Lancaster 370). Indirect methods are very limited in their implications, circulation statistics cannot measure the satisfaction of the patron with the materials checked out. Therefore, most user studies use direct methodologies, and specifically, the survey. Heidi Julien found that the survey method accounted for 60% of the research design in user studies between 1990 and 1994 (303). Surveys are used frequently in LIS because they are fairly simple to administer, as opposed to controlled experiments, and they target the opinions of use by the patrons. Surveys are administered in two general formats: asynchronous questionnaires and synchronous interviews.

Questionnaires provide convenience for the researcher and participant, while interviews provide the opportunity to collect more accurate responses and minimize question failure. Surveys provide quick quantifiable responses that are generalizable, thus the responses to a question in different studies can be compared. The ability to generalize and compare is important when trying to introduce the information needs of a neglected population, like film scholars, into the current body of literature. By using quantitative survey methods, the researcher can compare the attitudes and statements of use by film scholars to those from similar disciplines, like fine arts and humanities.

Through user studies, LIS researchers are able to describe the commonalities and differences in information-seeking behavior of various communities. Rebecca Watson-Boone reviewed the user studies of humanities research in her 1994 article. She concluded that humanists focus on their primary sources, the work of literature, or the documents of an era (205). The humanist is an independent researcher who rarely uses the public services of the library or the reference collection (208). The humanist strongly prefers monographs, but journals may be used depending on the contemporary nature of the topic (204). These scholars use their private collections and their colleagues to generate and refine ideas (206). Thus, humanists use the library for known items. They tend to be Luddites and do not independently explore many of the library's services. Boone says, "Humanists seek to provide a new interpretation of a subject, and humanities scholarship has a cumulative rather than summative nature. Thus, these researchers have limited need for developing or using general bibliographic tools and various other secondary information sources" (213).

Not only do humanists use only known items in the print world, but they are also pragmatists in the online environment. “Online tools pose a dilemma. Although humanities scholars appear to be willing to be trained in the use of certain tools, it also is clear that they will not use tools which they believe are unneeded” (Boone 8). Boone summarizes the findings of Wiberly and Jones,

“[Humanist] scholars used OPACs, but not online databases; used the catalog to find almost all secondary sources cited in their resulting publications; and used only a few formal bibliographies... And, they consulted special collections librarians/archivists, but almost never general reference librarians.”

Librarians must market online resources with vigilance since humanists use what works for them and do not seek the services of reference librarians, or the unproven potentials of the online environment. Thus, through Boone’s literature review she found humanists preferred independence and personal convenience in research and materials.

Ernst J. Schuegraf and Martin F. van Bommel conducted a two part survey of faculty at St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia on personal subscriptions to journals. They divided the faculty into three parts: science, arts, and professional programs. For their study the arts incorporated all humanities and fine arts disciplines. The arts faculty reported a total population of 80 with 323 personal subscriptions; 265 of the subscription titles were unique. The major reason faculty kept personal subscription was for research. Schuegraf and van Bommel say, “In the arts, very few journal subscriptions are received to sustain the teaching function...” (479). Schuegraf and van Bommel asked the faculty to rank the importance of the journal titles to which they



subscribe to their discipline as a whole and then to rank the importance of the journal titles to their personal research. They found, “nearly 81% of all journals have the same ranking of importance to the discipline and to the subscriber” (479). Schuegraf and van Bommel compared the personal subscriptions to the holdings of the library and found that 39.9 % of the individual subscriptions by arts faculty were not held by the library. In the case of 62 titles, however, the arts faculty thought the library did not receive the journal when in fact it did. The researchers also found that, “If the journal was perceived as not being in the library, the question was: Would the faculty member continue the personal subscription if the library should begin receiving the journal? Only 4.5% in the arts ... would cancel their subscriptions...” (481). In a final observation, Schuegraf and van Bommel found that most of the faculty subscribed to discipline specific titles and not general or education focused titles. Thus, personal journal subscriptions of arts faculty are for convenience and research needs and not instructional aid or general interest.

As Watson-Boone and Schuegraf and van Bommel discovered, humanists are well researched when it comes to print resources. In May 2002, Mary S. Laskowski conducted two surveys of audio-visual (AV) use; one of known users of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) Undergraduate library media center and a second survey of the faculty at large. Laskowski found that 47.2% of the known faculty were Arts and Humanities faculty and 40.9% were of the Social Sciences. She says, “Within the Arts and Humanities, the highest number of respondents were from the English department and the History department,” and of the Social Sciences, “... the highest number of respondents [were] in the Anthropology, Sociology and Speech Communication...” (79). The data showed that “the majority responded that they

consider non-print media material primary resources for educating their students” (86). The faculty of the Arts and Humanities agreed that media is an appropriate source to be cited in student writing (89). Faculty used the library media center most, followed by personal collections, departmental collections, and rental stores (88-89). Thus, the humanities use media in the classroom, encourage their students to use media in their writing, and the faculty at UIUC use the library media center as their primary resource for AV materials.

While the information seeking characteristics of humanists has been well investigated, there is a dearth of user studies of fine arts faculty. Bonnie Reed and Deborah Tanner surveyed the fine arts faculty of Texas Tech University. The survey targeted the information needs of this under studied patron population. A total of 48 faculty from the schools of music, art, theater and dance responded to the survey. Reed and Tanner’s survey collected demographics; assistant professors (29.2%) and associate professors (37.5%) were the most common respondents (230). They asked the faculty how often they use certain information sources: daily, weekly, monthly, semester, and never (231). On using library services Reed and Tanner found, “Faculty using the library were divided fairly equally in usage between weekly and monthly... Concerning remote access to the library offerings, 43.3% of faculty do not access the online catalog and 54.2% do not remotely access periodical databases” (230-231). While the faculty responded that the libraries were their primary information resource, the respondents also preferred to maintain their own private collections. From all the findings Reed and Tanner concluded, “The results of the survey indicate that a formal presentation of library

services and policies was necessary to introduce all faculty to the Libraries' offerings" (232).

Priscilla Atkins, the arts liaison and reference librarian at Hope College, found that to reach fine arts scholars she had to go to them, in the studio, drama class, and poetry class. She sat in on their production sessions, and the opportunity allowed her to show off the resources of the library, like resources for creating a character in a short story, or painting plates of a certain artist for inspiration (1087-1088). An important evaluation the librarians must make, according to Atkins, is to distinguish which arts classes can benefit from library service. Atkins recommends "tips for fostering information literacy in the arts" (1088). She says, "target specific classes to visit at least once a semester," "target specific classes for instruction sessions in the library," and, "review the library's collections (electronic and print) in the arts" (1088). Thus, since fine arts faculty are in a variety of teaching environments--studios, theatres, classrooms--it is necessary for the librarian to come to them and show how the library resources and librarians are beneficial in diverse educational environments.

Film Studies, also known as cinema studies, is an interdisciplinary field crossing the humanities and fine arts, even other interdisciplinary fields. While there are few studies of fine arts scholars' information seeking behavior, there currently are no user studies on film studies scholars. One possible reason for previous researchers not isolating film scholars is the fragmented nature of cinema studies. Unlike art or drama, film scholars do not usually reside in dedicated film programs, but are often isolated individuals in English or Communication departments. To get an understanding of the research concerns of the film scholar, one must turn to the literature of film studies. Much

of the literature of film scholars focuses on analysis of film as a text, or cinema as a historical and social phenomenon. The Society for Cinema and Media Studies publishes *Cinema Journal*, a journal which looks at the subject of film, cinema, and related visual media as well as the discipline and practice of cinema studies. Thus film studies, through *Cinema Journal* and the Society, defines its own research paradigms and learning agendas separate from the parent disciplines of the humanities or the fine arts.

In 2004, the Society published a special issue on the state of cinema studies and the future of the discipline. Film studies is an ever evolving field which had borrowed and retired many critical frameworks. As Frank Tomasolo says,

“Various academic acolytes have employed and defended their particular paradigm as the ‘latest and greatest’ from auteurism, phenomenology, and psychoanalysis, through semiotics, multiculturalism, Marxism, feminism, cultural studies, the New Historicism, poststructuralism, deconstructivism, and cognitivism. In turn, most of these methodologies have eventually, *mutatis mutandis*, been either incorporated or sublimated into some new synthesis or discarded outright as passé and irrelevant” (79).

With the staunch individualism of a humanist scholar, many film scholars work within one or a few paradigms. Tomasulo goes onto say, “Thus, by observing the field of cinema and media studies from a *sub specie aeternitatis* historical position, we can begin to see how the discipline has evolved (and not always on a teleological course), splintered, and balkanized into factions—at the same time that it has accepted diverse objects, methodologies, and constituencies into its domain [emphasis in the original]” (80). The individualism and “splintering” of film studies harkens back to Rebecca Watson-Boone’s

observation that the humanities are cumulative and not summative. Film studies is a culmination of singular research on film and cinema. Thus, film studies is constantly growing, reviewing and reshaping its research paradigms and methodologies.

Although the methodologies may have changed, historically, the discipline has maintained its focus on celluloid and the institutions built around the production and distribution of celluloid technology. However today, with the growth of digital technologies and the alternative production and distribution models available, film scholars also must incorporate new media to their subject matter. E. Ann Kaplan hopes,

“We need to recognize that film and media scholars have a multitude of interests in and reasons to show films: to teach a language; to study formalism; to explore politics, psychology and sociology; and to examine the relationship between cinema and virtual reality. Such scholars teach film in a wide variety of departments and institutional settings, by no means only in film and cinema departments” (86).

Kaplan sees the broadening of film studies into visual communication studies and the opportunity for more collaboration among the disciplines. Since film scholars do not reside mainly in film departments, not to broaden the media boundaries of film studies to include new visual media would isolate film scholars from other media scholars and from each other.

New media does not only provide disciplinary challenges, it also provides distributed access to traditional research. As Catherine Russell says,

“New media has altered film history almost immediately by making it more accessible. The canon is available at the local video store (and,

potentially, in our living rooms via satellite or broadband transmission), while specialized video stores and Internet provide access to the vaults of Hollywood and the popular cinemas of many different countries” (82).

New media enabled film studies to move beyond 16mm celluloid and projectors, to affordable DVDs and streaming video across a high speed internet connection. Film scholars are able to maintain research and autonomy because of developing media; they are privileged more than other disciplines by the multiple venues in which they can obtain their subject matter.

In 2000, the *Cinema Journal* published a special issue looking at the state of film studies curriculum and pedagogy in higher education. The contributors voiced concern over the fragmentation of the discipline, the skepticism of the students, and the unique knowledge and critical thinking concepts film scholars develop. Film scholars, unlike traditional humanists or fine arts faculty, have a monumental pedagogical challenge: to share the “splintered,” “balkanized” knowledge of film studies with students who in all likelihood are only going to take one film studies course, usually as an elective. Frank Tomasulo analyzed the general paradigms film scholars use to frame cinema studies. He identified five different paradigms used in film survey courses, “(1) aesthetic/textual history, (2) technological history, (3) film industry/economic history, (4) sociocultural history, and (5) historiography” (110). Again in the course curriculum, the faculty cumulate instead of summarizing the knowledge of film studies. Tomasulo muses, “So how do we choose? Probably most of us structure film history classes on the basis of our individual scholarly predilections” (111). Depending on the paradigm, Tomasulo argues that survey courses need different resources, from contemporaneous popular periodical

film reviews to zoning codes, public records, and demographic information (111-112).

Although most faculty will pick the framework they are most comfortable with to guide the film survey course, Tomasulo recommends conflating methodologies (112). He says,

“I believe that because film is simultaneously an art form, an economic institution, a cultural product, and a technology, only a dialectic survey course that shows how all these parts interact can fully acquaint the beginning student with all (or most) of the recognized approaches to the study of cinema history” (112).

Thus, film faculty have a large challenge and need diversity in their primary AV resources, and also in their secondary resources.

Since the paradigms of film studies are so broad, and film scholars are often dispersed among different academic departments, some film faculty become ambassadors for cinema studies. Peter Mascuch writes about his experiences “as the lone cinema studies specialist in the English department” (117). He says, “I have become dedicated to making film one of the regularly featured categories of texts that Writing about Literature includes” (117). In the course curriculum on textual analysis and composition, he teaches a two to three week session on the film as a text. The intention of bringing cinema studies into general education courses fulfills one of the major concepts of film studies, media literacy. Like information literacy in library science, film studies has created its own literacy objectives. The first part of media literacy is visual literacy, teaching media viewers to breakdown the image and recognize the techniques of the production. Visual literacy is necessary for criticism and production; it treats the film as art. Another part of media literacy is competence in understanding how the techniques used fit into a larger

stylistic framework, for instance, understanding the importance of set lighting and the film noir genre. Media literacy also encompasses the economic, social and historical impact of media. The final competency of media literacy is the ability to analyze critically what Jim Wehmeyer calls “the cultural politics of media” (100). Wehmeyer sees media literate students as able to recognize media monopolies and to resist the easy assumption that popular media is just entertainment.

The critical thinking competency of media literacy is a hard sell. As Greg S. Smith points out one of the unique issues for film faculty is disbelief by the students. He says, “The question arises almost every semester. My introductory film class and I will be hip deep in analyzing the details of a film and a hand will creep up, usually from the back: ‘Aren’t we reading too much into this? After all it’s just a movie’ (127). As scholars of popular culture, film faculty constantly must defend their pedagogy from the assumption that a movie is just mere entertainment. Smith points out that even the texts of William Shakespeare and Charles Dickens were considered “lowbrow” by past academics (132). Robin Bates speaks of the disinterest her students express when looking at the history of early cinema. She says, “Even when I am at my eloquent best, telling stories of how angry depression audiences vicariously lived through the transgression of James Cagney and Edward G. Robinson, my students are often skeptical” (84). Thus, not only do most film scholars teach in academic departments only tangentially related to film, but they also receive skepticism of their scholarship by media saturated students.

To combat the skepticism, Bates restructured her film history course to connect to the students’ personal histories to film, and eventually film history, through writing. Like fine arts faculty who are concerned with the primary source and the personal response,



her first writing assignment is for students to describe how a film affected or reflected their life. The initial personal assignment prepares the students for critical thinking and humanist inquiry into film history. She says, “In our discussions, the students draw on other general education courses they are taking, especially sociology, anthropology, and gender and ethnic studies classes” (86). By the final writing assignment, students research the historical and social issues of a genre, actor or director (88). Thus, film faculty must use personal writing and historical research methods to lure students into legitimizing cinema studies.

To summarize the literature, as an interdisciplinary study, film and cinema studies research is diverse, with film and media faculty housed in larger departments. Film faculty use humanist approaches to the film as text and cinema as institution, as well as fine arts approaches with production and film as art. The discipline thrives on continual change in research paradigms and the ambiguity of digital media. Film scholars benefit from the new media with distributed access to recorded video and streaming media. As educators, film scholars have tremendous flexibility in how they frame film courses. However, since many of the students will only have one experience with film studies, the faculty strive to incorporate multiple frameworks and develop critical media literacy competencies. Since film studies is a relatively new discipline, many film faculty act as advocates in larger departments and toward their students. Although film faculty have many obstacles to research and instruction, they are concerned and vocal about paradigms, the progression of the discipline, pedagogy, and effective instruction.

## **Methodology**

Since film faculty use a variety of paradigms, are housed in a variety of departments, use a broad range of primary and secondary resources, and have not been adequately targeted in library science user characteristics research, a study of the library use behaviors of the film scholars through a quantitative survey was developed. The population of interest in the study were 38 film scholars in the three research universities of the central North Carolina area. The film scholars of NCSU, UNC-CH, and Duke were identified through the websites of the film programs of each university. NCSU listed eight film scholars, UNC-CH listed seven, and Duke listed 23 affiliated faculty.

The survey was designed to identify if the interdisciplinary nature of the film scholars correlates to different patterns of library use. The survey had three sections: personal research collections, library collection use, and public services use (see Appendix 1). Many of the questions related to frequency of use with the answer options as daily, weekly, monthly, semester, and never. This is the structure Reed and Tanner used in their survey of the Texas Tech fine arts faculty. Since the population is small, 38 persons, the survey was mailed to the campus addresses of the entire population. Although the questions did not ask for specifics, like courses taught or demographic information, premising anonymity in such a small sample was a challenge. The study was approved by the UNC-CH Investigation Review Board (IRB). The survey included a cover letter explaining the purpose of this study, the participants' rights, and contact information (see Appendix 2). Upon receiving the data, the responses of the NCSU, UNC-CH, and Duke film scholars were compared to one another and to the responses of the Texas Tech fine arts faculty responses in the humanities studies.

### **Descriptive Statistics**

The visiting lecturers were omitted from the study, due to no response, leaving the film faculty population at 31. Fourteen participants returned complete surveys, 45.1% of the population, and 2 faculty declined to participate. Response rate varied between the institutions; NCSU was high, at 87%; UNC-CH had a 66% response rate, and Duke was low with a 23.5% survey return. All the participants were faculty: two were instructors, five were assistant professors, four were associate professors, and three were professors. Most of the respondents, 85.7%, taught film criticism courses; also 57.1% taught film history courses; 57.1% also taught film theory courses; and only 21.4% of the respondents taught film production courses.

When asked about personal research collections, the responses were surprisingly similar, 100% of the respondents said they owned personal print and AV research collections and all respondents said they added to those collections annually. The personal journal collections varied, with 64.3% of the respondents owning personal journal subscriptions in film studies, and 64.3% of the respondents owning personal journal subscriptions in other disciplines. While not everyone responded with specific title subscriptions, the most often listed personal subscription was *Cinema Journal* and *Film Quarterly*, both listed 4 times. Other titles of personal subscriptions were *Sight and Sound*, *Cineaste*, *Variety*, and the *Hollywood Reporter*. Of the respondents who have personal journal subscriptions in disciplines outside of film studies, 42.9% of the respondents subscribe to journals in English/literature. Respondents also identified journal subscriptions from the disciplines of art, American studies, language/linguistics, communications, and education.

The survey asked the faculty if their departments collected print resources, AV resources, journal subscriptions, or licensed databases. Only the faculty at Duke identified a departmental collection comprised of books and journals. When asked to identify which film studies journals the department subscribed to, each faculty member responded listing different titles with little overlap among the lists.

The latter portion of the survey asked film faculty how they use resources in the library. The faculty were asked if they browse the bookstacks. The response showed variable browsing behavior; 42.9 % said they browsed the bookstacks monthly and another 42.9 % said they browsed the bookstacks each semester. The faculty were asked if they browsed the periodical stacks, and 57.1 % said they browsed each semester. The respondents split on the frequency in which they checked out books in film studies, with 35.7% weekly, and 35.7% responding semester. Predictably, the respondents checked out books in other disciplines less frequently; 50% said monthly and 42.9% said each semester. The respondents also varied on photocopying periodicals, 28.6% weekly, 35.7% monthly, and 28.6% each semester. The respondents requested interlibrary loans 28.6% weekly, 35.7% monthly, and 28.6% each semester. The majority of participants 64.3% suggest book purchases to the library each semester.

Since AV resources are the primary sources for film faculty their use of library AV resources varies more than their use of secondary sources. The frequency of circulation of AV materials was the same for use in film studies research or in film instruction, with 42.9% of the respondents saying they checked out AV materials each week. Surprisingly, only six participants reported checking out AV materials for their

classes outside of film studies, and even then only each semester. Similar to print materials, the film faculty also recommend new AV purchases each semester.

The respondents unanimously identified the use of the internet for both research within film studies and within other disciplines. The majority of respondents said they used the library licensed databases both weekly or monthly, 35.7% and 28.6% respectively. The respondents also use the electronic journals heavily, with 57.1% claiming they access electronic journals weekly and 50% claiming they export, save or print out electronic journal articles weekly. Of all information resources, print or electronic, the most frequently used information resource for the participants was free online databases, like the Internet Movie Database (IMDb); 42.9% of the respondents access online databases daily. Thus, networked information, via the Internet, was a frequently accessed source.

The faculty were asked to rank information sources from 1 to 4 with 1 being the most used and 4 the least used, in several different information need situations. The information need situations were 1) ideas for research, 2) ideas for instruction, 3) materials for research, and 4) materials for instruction. The sources ranked were personal collections, departmental collections, the university library/ies, and the internet. Since the departmental collection was not applicable for a majority of the respondents, it was omitted from the ranking. The most frequently used source of information for ideas in research, materials for research and materials for instruction were the personal collections, followed by the Internet and then the library. The most popular source of information for ideas on instruction varied slightly, with 42.9% citing their personal collections first, 35.7% citing the library first, and 21.4% citing the Internet first. The

faculty were also asked to rate the library resources of their universities. The respondents of UNC-CH unanimously rated the library as comprehensive. The respondents of Duke split with half rating the library as research level and half rating it at the comprehensive level. Of the NCSU faculty, one rated the library comprehensive, three rated the library at research level and three rated the library at an instructional level.

The final section of the survey asked the film faculty if they used public services of the library. The majority responded that they consulted a reference librarian for research assistance each semester. The film faculty do not use the instruction services of the reference department; 85.7% responded that they never consult with a reference librarian for library instruction in a film studies class, and 78.6% responded that they never use library instruction in their other courses. The faculty were asked if they go to exhibits or workshops hosted by the library; only the faculty from NCSU responded that they participated in library sponsored events. Thus, the respondents use public services for research and not for instruction.

Since this survey was modeled after the survey of Bonnie Reed and Donald Tanner at Texas Tech, comparisons of responses can be made. Reed and Tanner found, "Faculty using the library were divided fairly equally in usage between weekly (41.7%) and monthly (39.6%)... Faculty use of the periodical databases varied from weekly (20.8%), to sometime during the semester (31.3%)" (230). The Texas Tech responses vary dramatically from the faculty response of the responses of this survey, with database use for research in film very high; 35.7% use databases weekly and only 7.1% use databases sometime in the semester.

Reed and Tanner found, “The majority of respondents indicated that they preferred to build their own collections as well as use the TTU libraries” (231). Reed and Tanner go on to say that different disciplines had personal collections in different materials; music faculty collected scores; theater and dance faculty collected videos and plays. This survey also confirms the Reed and Tanner observation, with 100% of the respondents maintaining personal print and AV collections. Reed and Tanner also concluded, “The primary information sources for faculty are TTU Libraries (89.6%), personal library (81.3%), colleagues (68.8%), Internet (64.6%) and bookstores (43.8%)” (231). While respondents indicated they use the library, they use their personal collections first, followed by the Internet, then the library. Thus, personal collections are still an important source for faculty, however the internet has replaced the library as a secondary source.

### **Implications**

There are limitations to the study. Mailing the survey during the spring semester generated a diminished response from participants, therefore limited broad generalizations can be made. Since the film faculty use more Internet resources, the study could be improved by asking more specific questions about information sources on the Internet. Posting the survey on a website may have generated more participation. Also, since neither NCSU nor UNC-CH identified departmental collections, those questions should be removed. This survey is reliable, because it is modeled after the survey of Reed and Tanner and it covers film faculty from three research level universities.

The findings do confirm that film faculty have similar research and library use behaviors to their counterparts in the broader humanities and fine arts disciplines.

Confirming the findings of Baker and Lancaster, film scholars prefer ease of access and ownership of resources. As Boone concluded of the humanities, film scholars use maintain and use their personal collection of print and AV materials more than any other resource. As Schuegraf and van Bommel found of the arts faculty, the respondents own personal journal subscriptions for research, with only one respondent subscribing to an education periodical. Also, all the titles listed as personal subscription were owned by the libraries at their university. Thus, ease of access and ownership are defining characteristics of the film faculty respondents.

As Boone found of the humanities, the film faculty use the libraries for known items, circulating books and photocopying periodicals more often than they browse the bookstacks or current periodical shelves. Laskowski found that the humanities and social sciences faculty do use AV materials in the classroom and use the media center's collection first. All the film faculty use AV materials in the classroom, however the libraries' media centers are not necessarily the primary resource. Every respondent used the media center's collection for research or instruction in a film class, but the frequency in which they used the library AV collection varied between respondent, and when ranking where they get materials for class or research, the library is ranked behind personal collections and the internet. Thus, the library is used for known items, but not as a first option.

An interesting deviation between the respondents of the survey and the literature is the increased reliance on information technology for resources. Most of the literature is from the beginning of remote access to online databases and electronic journals, and the humanists had not yet seen the potential of the distributed access. The film faculty



respondents however use materials available over the Internet more than materials available in the library. Even library licensed databases and electronic journals were used more than physical library materials, over half of the respondents access electronic journals each week whereas none of the respondents browse the current periodical shelves each week.

Of the respondents, three taught courses in production, two taught only production courses. The film faculty that specialized in production modeled the information seeking behavior of fine arts faculty. They responded with the most infrequent use of library resources, never using library licensed databases, print or electronic journals, or library instruction. Their response matches the observations of Reed and Tanner who found most fine arts faculty do not use remote access library materials. Although the production faculty used library materials either each semester, or never they still rated the library materials at a comprehensive level. Thus, production faculty do not use the generally use the resources of the library yet believe it is an important source for materials.

The film faculty rarely use the public services of the library, and do not see the connection between library instruction and the film curriculum. Since librarians and film faculty both have common competencies in critical literacy, there is opportunity for collaboration. Reed and Tanner do admit that “some faculty do not need all the services...liaison support should continue to be offered in all area” (232). As Atkins discovered, librarians will need to go to the faculty. Since Tomasulo recommends that film classes use a broad range of sources to present the history of film, librarians can assist film faculty by recommending resources. By presenting the commonalities between

information literacy and media literacy to faculty, librarians can “make patrons perceive the relevance of a service to their lives” (Baker and Lancaster 33).

## **Conclusion**

Film Studies is an interdisciplinary program which uses a broad range of information resources. Future studies on the population of film scholars could focus on their use of the Internet and the potential for digitized film collections in academic libraries. The library as a place is currently not an important resource for the film faculty. Further studies could investigate the use of the library in faculty—student research referrals or in student film production and research. For example, the media center at UNC-CH has a digital editing room. Other resources, like an auditorium or group study rooms with AV equipment may be useful to film students and faculty. Laskowski’s research on the how the faculty use the media center needs to be narrowed to the film scholars, since the media center is their primary sources. A use survey of the media center can target specific collection issues, like possible deficiencies in certain narrative film genres or national cinemas. Thus, the library and its resources need continued investigation in media collections and services to film scholars.

Librarians have many exciting film studies outreach opportunities. Reed and Tanner recommended newsletters to faculty and graduate students to keep them informed of the library services. Since the faculty of this study prefer the internet, an electronic newsletter, via e-mail or news blog, might be a better information source. To support the production needs of faculty and students, the library can maintain a collection of digital footage and sounds. With DVD technology, thousands of sounds for sound editing could be stored on one DVD. Since libraries already store faculty authored books and articles

and student authored dissertations and theses, the libraries should also collect faculty and student directed films. Again unlike the physical space demands of books, the short films of an entire class can be stored on one DVD.

To support classroom instruction, the scenes and films viewed in class can be digitized and stored in online courseware, like Blackboard, or in e-reserves. Of course there are copyright considerations, but streaming media is one solution, since the digital file is not transferred to the client's hard drive. One opportunity to assist in the literacy objectives of film studies is to co-author a tutorial with the film faculty. A visual literacy tutorial can combine the concepts and definitions with brief clips and images as examples; the definition of a dolly shot paired with a film clip. Since visual literacy is the basic competency of media literacy, a self-guided tutorial can open up class time to the more advanced competencies. Thus, for minimal physical space and a little training in multimedia librarians can offer useful services to film scholars.

Film scholars are library users, whether frequent or sparingly, all the survey respondents said they used their university libraries for some information service. The study revealed that film faculty prefer their personal collections and the Internet, resources convenient to them, for information seeking. The faculty do use the library for known items and little else. Librarians can do more to create useful services to film scholars, from viewing spaces in the library to collections and tutorials on the Internet. While this study was small, it has shown that film scholars use the library and more outreach and non-traditional service approaches could be relevant to their

## Appendix 1

1. I am a: (circle one)

Professor	Adjunct Professor/Lecturer	Other
Associate Professor	Teaching Assistant	
Assistant Professor	Research Assistant	

2. I teach courses on: (circle all that apply)

Film Criticism	Film Theory	I do not teach courses
Film History	Film/Video Production	

3. Do you have a personal collection of books and other print resources for research?

Y N

4. Do you select and add print materials to that collection annually?

Y N

5. Do you have a personal collection of audio/visual resources for research?

Y N

6. Do you select and add audio/visual materials to that collection annually?

Y N

7. Do you subscribe to any periodicals within the discipline of film studies?

Y N

If yes, which titles?

8. Do you subscribe to any professional periodicals outside the discipline of film studies?

Y N

If yes, which disciplines? (Check all that apply)

☐ English/Literature      ☐ History      ☐ Drama/Theatre      ☐ Psychology  
☐ Communication      ☐ Philosophy      ☐ Education      ☐ Art  
☐ Language/Linguistics      ☐ Sociology      ☐ Interdisciplinary  
☐ Pure Science

9. Do you use the Internet for research within the discipline of film studies?

Y N

10. Do you use the Internet for professional research outside of film studies?

Y N

11. Does your department keep a collection of books and print materials for use?

Y N

12. Does the department add to that collection annually?

Y N

13. Does the department subscribe to any periodicals within the discipline of film studies?

Y N

14. Does the department subscribe to any article index databases?

Y N

On a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 being the most used and 4 being the least used, rate how often you consult the following:

15. For ideas to generate research----

☐ Personal collection    ☐ Departmental collection    ☐ [name of the library]    ☐ Internet

16. For ideas to incorporate in your courses

\_\_\_Personal collection \_\_\_Departmental collection \_\_\_[name of the library] \_\_\_Internet

17. For materials to include in your research

\_\_\_Personal collection \_\_\_Departmental collection \_\_\_[name of the library] \_\_\_Internet

18. For materials to included in your courses

\_\_\_Personal collection \_\_\_Departmental collection \_\_\_[name of the library] \_\_\_Internet

Personal collection-Departmental collection-[name of the library]-Internet

Please read the following statement and circle the answer that most accurately matches your use of library print resources.

19. I browse the book stacks of [name of the library]:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

20. I check out books related to film studies from Perkins or Lilly Libraries:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

21. I check out books on other disciplines from [name of the library]:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

22. I browse the current periodicals at [name of the library]:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

23. I photocopy articles from periodicals owned by [name of the library]:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

24. I use interlibrary loan to receive materials from other libraries:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

25. I recommend new book or journal acquisitions for the libraries:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

Please read the following statement and circle the answer that most accurately matches your use of library audio visual resources.

26. I check out a/v resources for research purposes from [name of the library]

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

27. I check out a/v resources for film courses from the [name of the library]

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

28. I check out a/v resources for non-film courses from [name of the library]

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

29. I recommend new audio/visual acquisitions for the [name of the library]

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

Please read the following statement and circle the answer that most accurately matches your use of library electronic resources.

30. I access library licensed databases for film studies research:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

31. I access library licensed databases for other research:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

32. I access library licensed electronic journals:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

33. I print, save, or export articles from library licensed electronic journals:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

34. I access library licensed electronic books:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

35. I access free online databases:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

36. How would you rate the library resources of [home institution]?-Basic-Instructional-Research-Comprehensive

Please read the following statement and circle the answer that most accurately matches your use of library public services.

37. I consult with a reference librarian for a research assistance:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

38. I consult with a librarian for library instruction in my film studies courses:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

39. I consult with a librarian for library instruction in my other courses:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

40. I attend exhibits or readings hosted by the library:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never

41. I attend workshops hosted by the library:

daily      weekly      monthly      semester      never



## Appendix Two



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

AT

CHAPEL HILL

Student Research Project  
School of Information and Library Science  
Phone# (919) 962-8366  
Fax# (919) 962-8071

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
CB# 3360, 100 Manning Hall  
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-3360  
info@ils.unc.edu

### Film Studies Faculty and Library Use

I am a Master's student in the School of Library and Information Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Your participation is requested in my research project examining how film studies scholars use the library. Through the Film Studies program websites of Duke University, North Carolina State University, and departmental websites of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill I have identified 38 local film scholars. The invitation for participation is extended to you because you are listed as faculty associated with a film studies program and/or list film as an area of research interest on a department website. By identifying the characteristics of library use I hope to develop recommendations that address the quality of materials and services to film scholars.

In an effort to understand how film scholars use the library, I have included a survey. The survey should take only twenty minutes to complete. Included with the survey is a return address stamped envelope. If at any time during the survey or after the survey, you wish to discontinue your participation you may do so. Additionally, you may decline to respond to any of the survey questions. In order to protect your privacy, neither your name nor your department will be identified.

If you have any questions or concerns about the survey please contact me, Amanda Myers, via telephone, 919-619-3979, or email, [a.myers@unc.edu](mailto:a.myers@unc.edu). You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Evelyn Daniel at 919-962-8062 or via email at [daniel@ils.unc.edu](mailto:daniel@ils.unc.edu).

The Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board (AA-IRB) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has approved this study. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this study, please contact the AA-IRB at 919-962-7761 or at [aa-irb@unc.edu](mailto:aa-irb@unc.edu).

**I agree to participate in this survey. I understand that I can discontinue my participation at anytime. I will keep one copy of this consent for my records and return the other signed copy to the researcher with the survey.**

---

Signature of Participant

---

Date

### Works Cited

- Atkins, Priscilla. "Information Literacy and the Arts: Be There or Miss It!" College and Research Libraries News 62.11 (December 2001), 1086-1088, 1092.
- Baker, Sharon L. and F. Wilfrid Lancaster. The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services. Arlington, VA: Information Resources Press, 1991.
- Bates, Robin. "Connecting to Film History through Writing." Cinema Journal 41.1 (Fall 2001), 83-89.
- Julien, Heidi and Lawrence J. Duggan. "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Information Needs and Use Literature." Library & Information Science Research 22.3 (2000). 291-309.
- Kaplan, E. Ann. "The State of the Field: Notes toward an Article" Cinema Journal 43.3 (Spring 2004), 85-88.
- Laskowski, Mary S. "Faculty and Instructor use of media in the classroom: Results of Two Surveys." Media Review 9.1 (Fall/Winter 2002-03), 73-95.
- Mascuch, Peter. "Cinema in the English Department Introductory Course, or, How the Make Film an 'Element of Literature'." Cinema Journal 41.1 (Fall 2001), 117-121.
- Rabinowitz, Celia. "Working in a Vacuum: A Study of the Literature of Student Research and Writing." Research Strategies 17 (2000), 337-346.
- Reed, Bonnie and Donald R. Tanner. "Information Needs and Library Services for the Fine Arts Faculty." Journal of Academic Librarianship 27.3 (May 2001), 229-233.

Russell, Catherine. "New Media and Film History: Walter Benjamin and the Awakening of Cinema." Cinema Journal 43.3 (Spring 2004), 81-85.

Smith, Greg M. "'It's Just a Movie': A Teaching Essay for Introductory Media Classes." Cinema Journal 41.1 (Fall 2001), 127-134.

Tomasulo, Frank P. "In Focus: What is Cinema? What is Cinema Journal?" Cinema Journal 43.3 (Spring 2004), 79-81.

Tomasulo, Frank P. "What kind of Film History Do We Teach?: The Introductory Survey Course as a Pedagogical Opportunity." Cinema Journal 41.1 (Fall 2001), 110-114.

Walters, William H. "Video Media Acquisitions in a College Library." Library Resources and Technical Services 47.4 (October 2003), 160-170.

Wang, Peiling. "Methodologies and Methods for User Behavioral Research." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology 34. Martha E. Williams Ed. Medford, NJ: Information Today, 1999. 53-99.

Watson-Boone, Rebecca. "The Information Needs and Habits of Humanities Scholars." RQ 34.2 (Winter 1994), 203-. Expanded Academic ASAP. Infotrac. NCLIVE. 29 Nov. 2003 <<http://infotrac.galegroup.com/menu>>.

Wehmeyer, Jim. "Critical Media Studies and the North American Media Literacy Movement." Cinema Journal 41.1 (Fall 2001), 94-101.